

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make
orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

<i>Signs of the Times:</i>	PAGE
Blessed are the Peacemakers	337
Fifty Years of Clerical Experience	339
Reactions to the Assumption	341
Schweitzer's <i>Confessio Fidei</i>	342
Modernists and Unitarians	344
'The Vantage Ground of the Truth'	345
The Papal Hierarchy in England	346
Science, Religion and Moral Judgments by the Bishop of Birmingham	347
Teaching Local Church History by two Masters in Oundle School	355
Religious Education and the Churches by the Headmaster of Durham School	359
<i>In Memoriam</i>	
The Bishop of Truro by the Dean of St. Paul's	362
R. Gladstone Griffith by Sir Henry Self	364
A Layman's Reading by John Rowland	369
Christianity and Judaism by Prof. Marcel Simon of Strasbourg	372
Correspondence	383



OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 3/- net. Annual Subscription, 11s.

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

The Right Rev.

R. C. MORTIMER, D.D., M.A.

Bishop of Exeter

'First-rate introduction.'—CHURCH TIMES.

'In the central Christian tradition . . . This is an excellent book on the duties of the Christian life.'—THE TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM

THOMAS CORBISHLEY,

S.J., M.A.

Master of Campion Hall, Oxford

'It would be hard to find any better general discussion of Romanism.'—CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEWSPAPER.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

R. M. FRENCH

An outline of its historical development, touching upon the cultural and aesthetic background and providing some account of the Orthodox worship and doctrinal position among the Churches of Christendom.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS CONFLICTS

MAURICE SIMON, M.A.

An account of the principal cleavages within the Jewish people since the close of the Old Testament over questions of religious faith, doctrine and practice, particularly of those that are most recent and divide the Jewish community at the present day.

AN INTRODUCTION TO PERSONALITY STUDY

RAYMOND B. CATTELL

*Research Professor in Psychology,
University of Illinois*

A presentation of what scientific research has discovered about the development of human individuality.

7s. 6d. each

HUTCHINSON'S
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

RIPON HALL, OXFORD

Founder: Bishop BOYD CARPENTER,
D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O.

Warden: The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF TRURO

Principal: The Rev. Canon R. D. RICHARDSON
M.A., B.Litt., Hertford College, Oxford

Vice-Principal: The Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.
Sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford

Tutor: The Rev. J. R. H. THOROLD, M.A.
King's College, Cambridge

Treasurer: The Rev. Canon H. D. A. MAJOR
D.D., F.S.A.

Ripon Hall provides a training on modern lines for those seeking Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Ripon Hall is licensed for residence by the University of Oxford. This privilege permits its members to pursue their theological studies in the University and to qualify for the Diploma and Degrees in Theology.

Full particulars of Courses, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall, and to its endowment.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD

By

The Rev. E. J. PULSFORD

Gratis — Post 1d.

If you were interested in the papers read at the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Bristol, you will want to possess this little booklet.

Order from:—

N. C. PRESS LTD.,
20 BLOOMSBURY WAY,
LONDON, W.C.1.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4

DECEMBER

VOL. XL

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

BLESSED ARE THE PEACE-MAKERS

Lord Lindsay, Master of Balliol, during the Second World War, achieved a valuable piece of Gospel exegesis when he pointed out that it was not the peace-lovers, the peace-wishers, the peace-talkers whom Christ's Beatitude named as the Children of God, but the peace-makers.

It is the cruel misfortune of those sincere pacifists (more correctly passivists) who are devoted lovers of peace that by forbidding the use of force in the last resort as a means of securing peace they become promoters of war. If you wish for peace prepare for war, was the practical motto of those who secured world-peace in the age when Christ was born, and the angels sang 'peace on earth among men of good will.'

The price of such peace-making is high and is paid in the last resort by those who give their lives on its behalf. Unfortunately passivism, which until recently was only a well-meaning and involuntary agent in promoting war, is now being deliberately and cunningly propagated by the adherents of aggressive tyranny in order to secure the military enslavement of their passivist victims. This it seeks to achieve by charging its destined victims with war-mongering should they dare to make preparations to resist aggression. As a consequence, to-day secretive passivist methods are being promoted in Great Britain, not simply by our well-meaning but deluded fellow-citizens but by foreign passivist propaganda organized by our subtle enemies bent on the destruction of our democratic freedom.

Our Prime Minister, in an incisive and incontestable speech delivered to the Foreign Press Association in London on November 1st, dealt faithfully with what he called the 'bogus' Peace Congress arranged to assemble at Sheffield on November 13th—a Congress banned both by our Labour Unions and by our Christian Churches.

Mr. Attlee's pungent and responsible criticism published in *The Times* of November 2nd is reflected in the following citations from his speech :

'The support for the action of the United Nations in countering aggression in Korea has been world wide. The only exception has been the adherents of the Cominform. Yet these are the people who are now promoting a so-called peace conference which is to be held at Sheffield this month. . . .

Of course, the Communists say that this conference is not organized by them. Communist activities generally are camouflaged—in this country they can usually get a few respectable but misguided people to provide the sheeps' clothing—but a denial by a Communist does not carry much weight. It is part of their doctrine that lying is perfectly legitimate to further their cause. . . .

More than 90 per cent. of the members of its permanent committee are known to be Communists or fellow travellers. What are their aims? They are very simple. They are to try to paralyse the efforts of the democracies to arm themselves. They seek to persuade the workers of the democracies to refuse to manufacture arms. At the very same time they urge the workers of the totalitarian States to increase their efforts in munition production. . . .

So long as fear, suspicion, and jealousy persist, agreements to reduce armaments or to abstain from the use of certain methods of war will achieve nothing. What we must have is the desire for peace and the will to agree. Given those, then questions of the place, the method, and the persons through whom agreement is to be reached, would raise no difficulty.'

The Guardian of October 27th published the following declaration made by the British Council of Churches explaining why they were unable to be represented at the Sheffield Peace Congress. Emanating from so comprehensive a Christian Federation this pronouncement is of the highest significance. It runs as follows :

1. The British Council of Churches acknowledges the invitation of the British Peace Committee to send delegates to the World Peace Congress in Sheffield next month. The Council is unable to accept the invitation for reasons which it desires to state the more explicitly because it recognizes that there will be those attending this Congress who will do so from a genuine devotion to peace.

2. The Council is convinced that the way to world peace, at this moment in world history, is through a repudiation of and resistance to aggression, an expanding justice and an increasing devotion to common moral principles. The Council would give its wholehearted support to any genuine effort by men of different nations, parties and creeds on this basis.

3. The Council notes, however, that, while claiming to be champions of peace, the promoters of this Congress have no word of condemnation for the Communist aggression launched against South Korea on June 25; and make no proposal for the ending of the deadlock by which Soviet opposition arrests the conclusion of outstanding peace treaties and

prevents the peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict in conformity with the United Nations Charter.

4. The Council regards the banning of atomic and similar weapons as essential to the preservation of contemporary civilization. But confidence in the sincerity of any plan for banning depends on confidence in the sincerity of the Power that proposes the plan. Confidence is created by deeds—not by words.

5. The Council declines to take any part in this Peace movement because it is mainly an instrument of Cominform propaganda, and warns Christian people not to be deluded into giving it their support, however earnestly they may long for better international relations and however strong may be their loathing of war.

In this connection we should wish to call attention to a trenchant criticism of the recent Peace Congress held in Czechoslovakia. It is an open letter addressed to Unitarian ministers in Czechoslovakia and is published in full in *The Inquirer* of October 14th. It insists that those who 'talk peace' should also speak the truth.

'Truth,' it asserts, 'can be helped by the exchange of knowledge and ideas. . . . The greatest service to peace would be to break down the barriers that exist between countries, and allow the free flow of information between all the peoples of the world. You have sent me your pamphlet on peace. It has entered freely into this country. May this letter enter as freely into your country.'

FIFTY YEARS OF CLERICAL EXPERIENCE

Canon Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Chaplain to the King, delivering his jubilee sermon in the Parish Church of Birmingham where he had been rector for many years, treated Church trends and tendencies as he had experienced them in the course of his strenuous pastoral life. His sermon, which demands attention from our Church leaders, is published in full in the August number of the *Wimbledon Parish Magazine*.

'I was brought up as an evangelical, but I soon became with others deeply concerned with winning freedom for the evangelical from the trammels of verbal inspiration and narrow ceremonial. To a large extent we succeeded. . . .

It was a time of great expectation and hope in the Church of England. After the first world war men like Dick Sheppard and Studdert Kennedy were stirring men's minds. The Life and Liberty Movement led by Temple was at its height. The Doctrinal Commission had been appointed to explore the possibilities of Doctrinal Agreement and the Lambeth Conference of 1920 roused in all men the hope of Reunion. The will to experiment—the readiness to create new precedents—was perhaps stronger then than it had ever been in the Church of England. It looked for the moment as if Church life might be refashioned to meet the needs of the twentieth century. I cannot say that those hopes have been fulfilled for there has sprung up renewed rigidity in recent years, but at that time we really did seem to see heaven open and the New

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the Pacific

Jerusalem descending out of heaven upon Lambeth Palace and the Church Assembly. . . .'

After dealing with his intense interest in the ordination of women and the promotion of inter-communion among all Christian people, Canon Guy Rogers proceeds :

'Neither of these causes is lost. . . . The Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford goes so far as to say that not only will women be ordained to the priesthood in the Church of England but, passing far beyond the limits of my own faith, that they will surely also one day be ordained to the Priesthood in the Church of Rome.

But whatever may be said about the cause of women, so shabbily treated when employed as parish workers, the cause of Intercommunion has made great progress in my own time. . . . Long ago I made up my mind that it was not God's will for me at any rate to abstain from communicating with my Free Church brethren. During my twenty-three years' ministry in this church not only have they always been welcome at our Celebrations of Holy Communion, but from time to time accompanied by representative groups from St. Martin's I have gone to share in their communions and to receive the Sacrament at the hands of their ministers. . . . Others may regard intercommunion as the coping stone of structural unity—that is indeed still the official policy of the Church of England—but to me and many others within our Church it is the stepping stone into fuller fellowship by which alone this structural unity can be achieved. . . .

Perhaps in my opposition to the growing institutionalism in the Church, I have been less in a minority than on other questions. It is unkind to speak of the centralization and regimentation now growing apace, and which is so well intended, as *totalitarianism* lest the word prejudice the issue; but all the tendencies of policy in high quarters would seem to bear that stamp. It will be much more difficult for pioneers to exist and make their influence felt when we are all living under Canon Law. . . . There is a real danger that when we have tidied up the Church of England in the interests of efficiency, we may have destroyed its originality and robbed it of its prophets, and when we have succeeded in separating it from the State, we may have condemned it to an ecclesiastical tyranny much more grievous to bear. It is the old story—acting on what would appear to be Christian principles, we succeed in producing un-Christian results. . . .'

The doctrine of the Incarnation is vital to my faith, but I am afraid I distrust the confident and self-assured theology of the present day which draws its strength from Barthianism and Neo-Calvinism and looks a little scornfully on scientific enquiry and the tentative approach of Christian humanism. . . .

Looking back upon Church affairs, it would seem that the liberalism in which I moved quite happily in my earlier days has been succeeded by a new era of systematic theology which gives temporary satisfaction and assurance to those who can accept it.'

Few open-minded students of our English Church life will differ from the comments of Canon Guy Rogers on his half-century of ministerial experience in the Church of England. Yet had his ministry for that period been in any other Christian Church we venture to think it would have been much more depressing.

The Church of England still possesses potentialities which are unique, and it is loyalty to them, as seen, for instance, in the ministry of the late Bishop of Truro, which is needed to enable that Church to recover her spiritual and moral leadership in English life.

Canon Guy Rogers in his ministry has done much in this sphere. Why are there not more of his kind in positions of influence in the Church of England? That is a question for the bishops to answer. Prime Ministers cannot promote 'the inferior clergy' to bishoprics.

FREE CHURCH REACTIONS TO THE NEW PAPAL DOGMA

In our September issue (p. 180) we published with the hearty agreement of all Modernist Churchmen the pronouncements of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York protesting against the authorization of the papal dogma of the bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary, since proclaimed by the Pope on All Saints' Day in St. Peter's, Rome.

We are glad that the Free Church Federal Council has, in harmony with the action of our Primates, made the following pronouncement set forth by its Moderator in a letter to *The Times* of November 3rd:

'Now that the Pope has definitely declared the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary to be a dogma of faith, I am asked by the Free Church Federal Council to make a brief statement. If a pronouncement on this matter had been made by some authority in the Church of Rome merely as a possible opinion or conviction, we could have regarded this as a speculation concerning a supposed event in an unseen world and calling for no particular comment. But now a papal directive is given on what is set out not as a theory but as a fact, and, moreover, on what is declared to be an essential fact. The solemnity and ceremony attending the promulgation stress acceptance of the dogma, in the eyes of Rome, as being imperative for salvation, and suggest their view of its rejection as involving eternal loss. There, non-Roman Christians may well feel compelled to express serious concern and to utter an earnest disclaimer.

If this proclamation were addressed only to members of the Church of Rome, Free Churchmen would be distressed. But with the utmost publicity the Pope is speaking to the world and is claiming to speak in the exercise of a divinely conferred infallibility. Free Churchmen therefore are driven to say that they have not so learned Christ. The truth as it is in Jesus which they have learned from the New Testament finds no place for this dogma, which therefore should not be included in things vital for saving faith. Fundamentally we are gravely disturbed not because this action erects—as it does—a formidable barrier to any future Church reunion, but much more because it may have lamentable deterrent effects now upon any seeker after the way of salvation.

When we see, as now we do, entrance into a present and full experience of our Lord's redeeming activity in the soul of any man made, in effect, dependent upon that for which there is no scrap of biblical

evidence, we are unable to keep silence but must emphatically protest that this is a departure from the purity of the faith laid down once for all in holy writ. An article in *The Times* on October 31st, 1949, on "Roman Catholics and Other Christians" stated: "The Holy Year which Pope Pius is shortly to inaugurate may well prove more momentous than any in the Church's history. . . . There is widespread hope that Rome will make a gesture to the Christian world in keeping with the realities of the hour." That hope, alas, has not been realized.

DR. SCHWEITZER'S *Confessio Fidei*

Albert Schweitzer, the Saint of Christian Modernism, who in his heroic missionary labours in the Congo has united the minimum of Christian dogmatic traditionalism to the maximum of Christian self-sacrificing service, has just published his *Confessio Fidei* as the Epilogue to an exposition of his theology by a life-long member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, Lt.-Col. E. N. Mozley, the great-nephew of Cardinal Newman and of the notable Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, E. R. Mozley.

In his concise essay¹ Lt.-Col. Mozley summarizes the essentials of Schweitzer's theological thought as presented in Schweitzer's four notable treatises: *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, *Paul and His Interpreters*, and *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Of these four by far the most influential was *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Schweitzer's conclusions in this volume, although variously estimated in the world of New Testament scholarship, have exercised an enormous influence both in Christian and anti-Christian circles. Indeed, it may be questioned whether any other theological volume published during the last fifty years has been so revolutionary in its results. It discredited the Liberal Protestant estimate of the mission and message of Jesus and provided for Roman Catholicism and Anglo-Catholicism new methods of defence against liberal New Testament criticism.

The spearhead of Schweitzer's attack on the Liberal Protestant conclusions was, briefly, that they radically underestimated

'the extent and nature of the influence of late Jewish eschatology upon Jesus' expectation and proclamation of the Kingdom of God, and upon the way in which he regarded himself as Messiah' (p. 80).

Although Schweitzer's conclusions were accepted very widely, they were opposed by such eminent New Testament scholars as R. H. Charles and B. H. Streeter.

Whilst Schweitzer's presentation of Jesus in the *Quest* strengthened the faith of some Christians in Jesus, it deprived

¹ *The Theology of Albert Schweitzer for Christian Enquirers*. By E. N. Mozley. (A. and C. Black, 1950; 7/6.)

many others of their faith in Him. What is of real significance in Dr. Schweitzer's latest *Confessio Fidei* is his development of his former conclusions. This development is apologetic and non-controversial.

To summarize Schweitzer's latest exposition : while Jesus was essentially right as to the nature of the Kingdom of God and the need of mankind to seek it and realize it, He was wrong in His teaching about the nearness of the Coming of the Kingdom (*Parousia*) and in the cataclysmic apocalyptic manner of its coming. Christian history and Christian experience have confuted both these beliefs about the coming of the Kingdom, but this does not deprive Jesus of his spiritual and moral authority because the time and manner of the coming of the Kingdom are absolutely secondary to the nature of the Kingdom and of mankind's relation to the Kingdom. Schweitzer writes :

'It is hard for us to bring ourselves to the point of admitting that Jesus, who is uniquely endowed with the Spirit of God, and is for us the supreme revealer of religious and spiritual truth, does not stand above his age in the way that might seem to be demanded by the significance which he has for all ages.

To me, however, Jesus remains what he was. Not for a single moment have I had to struggle for my conviction that in him is the supreme spiritual and religious authority, though his expectation of the speedy advent of a supernatural Kingdom of God was not fulfilled, and we cannot make it our own' (p. 104).

On the other hand, Schweitzer writes :

'Jesus spiritualises the conception of the Kingdom of God, in that he brings it into subjection to his ideal and ethic of love. In due time this transforms the conception of the Kingdom' (p. 105).

'Again mankind as a whole is changing its mind as to what it really means.

Modern faith finds the beginning of the Kingdom of God in Jesus and in the Spirit which came into the world with him. We no longer leave the fate of mankind to be decided at the end of the world. The time in which we live summons us to new faith in the Kingdom of God.

We are no longer content, like the generations before us, to believe in the Kingdom that comes of itself at the end of time. Mankind to-day must either realise the Kingdom of God or perish. The very tragedy of our present situation compels us to devote ourselves in faith to its realisation' (p. 106 f.).

So it will be said that Liberal Protestantism has won after all. Yes, it has won on the issues of the nature of the Kingdom of God and the methods of its realization in human society and in human personality. It has won spiritually and ethically but it has not won historically. This is Schweitzer's conclusion :

'Modern Protestantism substitutes its view of the Kingdom of God and its coming for the eschatological view which Jesus presented as if it

really represented the original. Historically both are wrong; but religiously both are right' (p. 101).

Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums* (*What is Christianity?*) is thus justified as a guide to the Christian life for the modern man.

MODERNISTS AND UNITARIANS

The Inquirer of October 21st publishes an article, 'Modernists and Unitarians,' by G. Randall Jones, which undertakes to answer the suggestion of a correspondent that

'the Unitarian Fellowship, while keeping its present organization going, might make a better contribution to the spread of "Christianity in its simplest and most intelligible form" by putting all its weight into the Modern Churchmen's Union instead of concentrating on trying to increase its own influence.'

The reply of Mr. Randall Jones to this daring suggestion is marked by sympathetic understanding but is in substance a definite *non possumus*.

Many years ago, in discussing this issue with a leading Unitarian, we urged (1) that as a preliminary the popular but misleading terms Unitarian and Trinitarian should be abandoned in presenting the Christian doctrine of God, since both terms are misleading; (2) that the Christian doctrine of Divine Incarnation in Jesus Christ should be presented in harmony with the *Logos* Christology of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel (*John* i, 1-14 inclusive).

In the Prologue the Incarnation is presented, not as an isolated historic event, accomplished by a Virgin Birth, but as the supremely significant realization of a Divine Creative process uniquely realized in Jesus Christ, and in those who thus receive Him the process of Divine Incarnation is carried forward and they are themselves born of God. By holding fast to the Incarnation as a Divine Creative process realized significantly for human history in Jesus Christ all the essential values of that central doctrine of the Christian Faith can be secured, maintained and developed under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth.

It is dogmatic insistence on the Virgin Birth as the sole mode of the Divine Incarnation in Jesus Christ which Unitarians are unable to accept, and in this the English Modernists are in agreement with them. The point of separation between Unitarians and English Modernists is reached when Unitarians, because they reject the Virgin Birth mode of Incarnation, reject the doctrine of Divine Incarnation altogether and deny the manifestation of a unique and supreme example of Divine Incarnation in Jesus Christ.

Where Unitarians do not assert this negation of Divine Incarnation uniquely realized, under human limitations, in Jesus

Christ, there is really no dogmatic reason in the light of the *Doctrinal Report* why they should not become members of the Church of England and give valuable assistance to the extension of modern liberal Christian thought within the National Church.

Martineau, Stopford Brooke, Thom, Estlin Carpenter, James Drummond were compelled by their convictions to do their great work of liberalising and modernizing Christian doctrine outside the Church of England. But to-day their spiritual descendants are not subject to the same ecclesiastical inhibitions and conditions. Not a few of them might find a more influential and congenial sphere as Christian theists within the Fellowship of the National Church.

THE VANTAGE GROUND OF THE TRUTH'

The serious consequences of the Archbishop of Canterbury's public condemnation of Dr. C. J. Wright as it affects the teaching of the Christian Religion in our schools and colleges is stressed by Canon M. T. Dunlop, Director of Religious Education for the Diocese of Manchester, in the following letter to the *Church of England Newspaper* of September 15th :

'The significance of Dr. Fisher's rebuke to Dr. C. J. Wright is that it is a public disowning of an accredited teacher of the Church of England by the Primate of that Church, speaking on behalf of its "corporate mind." Dr. Fisher, by his laboured references to St. Augustine's College and by his insistence that Dr. Wright is to sever his connection with it when it becomes a central theological college of the Church, in effect, declares that a teacher of the Church's faith may not dissent from belief in the Virgin Birth.

The Primate's statement touches not only the clergy but all who teach religion in Church of England schools and all such Anglican teachers in other schools. It touches all Anglican teachers in the ancient universities and those who seek privately to expound the Anglican faith in modern universities. Nor does the statement only affect those who share Dr. Wright's opinion. What is at stake is the liberty of the teacher to state the results of responsible study. The statement places teachers in a painful dilemma. As teachers, they are peculiarly concerned to uphold the authority of the Church, which is their own credential. They are equally concerned with the truth.

The view, of recent growth in one section of the Church, that a clerical teacher has obligations of belief more numerous and stricter than those resting upon the ordinary clergy has no validity. It is as confused as the view that the clergy must believe more than the laity. The test of a belief is its truth, not the status of the believer. But a teacher, by the nature of his function, must every day publicly make manifest the correspondence of authority and truth. This is always an exacting task upon the performance of which depends the renewal for each generation of a faith both continuous and contemporary. It has been a glory of the Church of England, taken on the whole, that the teacher has found it a possible task. Anglican authority resting upon truth and serving it.

It is, therefore, obvious that the situation created by Dr. Fisher's statement cannot be allowed to remain. A very great number of teachers are not convinced by the evidence for the Virgin Birth. Many others are persuaded that their colleagues have the right to state their view. What are we to do? We can neither abandon truth nor ignore the authority of the Primate of our Church. Nor may a teacher find escape in mental reservation and silence.

It was in 1914 that the Archbishops at that time resolved this same dilemma of the teacher, created by the impact of Biblical criticism upon traditional beliefs, by a declaration that theologians might publish and teach the result of their studies. Dr. Fisher's statement is frightening evidence of how far truth has become a casualty of two world wars and the threat of a third. In the last analysis it is the Church which guards truth, for it is the Church that is concerned with those ultimates by which men live, for which they will die, and in which a love of truth must be rooted. To disown a scholarly teacher of the Church for stating a result of his studies which has had the support of numerous other scholars over many years, is to undermine the citadel of truth from within.'

It is nearly a century since Frederick Temple, Headmaster of Rugby and Archbishop of Canterbury, laid down the principle: 'Where conclusions are prescribed, research is precluded.'

As a Christian educationist the Church of England to-day must look to her laurels—unless she decides to exchange her laurel-wreath for a tiara.

THE CENTENARY OF THE PAPAL HIERARCHY IN ENGLAND

In 1850 the Pope was legally permitted to re-establish the Roman Hierarchy in England, suppressed and expelled in Tudor times. Since 1850 Roman Catholicism has made great strides in Britain. How great precisely cannot be ascertained owing to our Census failing to include (unlike the great Dominions) a column dealing with religion.

This Roman Catholic increase is mainly due to the invasion of Britain by Irish Roman Catholics and continental refugees. As a result the Lowlands of Scotland, not so long ago the home of a solid Presbyterian community, is to-day overrun by Irish and Polish adherents of the Papacy. Another cause of Roman Catholic increase is due to 'conversions' for which our Anglo-Catholic clergy have done not a little to prepare the way—devotionally and doctrinally. A further cause of increase is the large size of Roman Catholic families due to the Romanist prohibition of contraceptive birth control.

Some readers would add another cause of Roman Catholic increase—the political popularity of Papalism as the most effective ecclesiastical opponent of Marxian Communism. This motive counts for very little in England, whether among our educated or uneducated classes. In this country politics are not so feeble as

to be dependent on clericalism except in constituencies where the Irish invasion predominates.

The danger, however, which attends Roman Catholic increase in this country is that the Papacy, 'the ghost of the Roman Empire,' is very strongly political and never fails to do its best to exert a political influence in every country of the world in which it secures power. It was this political activity of the Papacy which led to its extirpation in Japan and to-day accounts largely for its persecution in Marxist Communist states. Hence Romanism becomes not only a divisive factor in the religious world but also a divisive factor in the political world.

It is not its devotional and dogmatic superstition which causes Englishmen to view the increasing influence of Romanism with apprehension but its divisive influence in the national life — both religious and political. Political parties are a necessity in a free national life, but political parties dominated or created by ecclesiastical denominations are as great an enemy to the political life of a nation as they are to its religious life. We have recently observed in the Press references to a 'Catholic Action' organization which would appear to be of this character. It will not be long before we find it threatening timid politicians with a 'Catholic block vote.'

The late Bishop Percival used to say: It makes for social stability when political parties and ecclesiastical parties cut across each other at right angles.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND MORAL JUDGMENTS*

By the RT. REV E. W. BARNES, F.R.S.

WITH the discovery — roughly in the fifteenth century — of the literature of Graeco-Roman civilization, the medieval order of Western Europe began to break up. Ancient beliefs crumbled: many old religious superstitions, in spite of the efforts of the powerful and well-organized medieval Church, began to seem foolish. Moral judgments changed: for example, to burn a man for heresy began to seem barbarous: to drown an old woman as a witch lost such moral seemliness as it had ever had. Changes in belief led to religious divisions, and they in turn to wars. The more conservative wings of the ancient Church continued to proclaim the truth of so-called immutable beliefs; but they silently abandoned ideas and practices which had lost their cogency. So

* British Association: Birmingham Meeting, at the Great Hall, University of Birmingham, on Sunday, September 3rd, 1950. Evening discourse.

it came about that the post-renaissance world differed profoundly from that of the Middle Ages. The old unity of Western European civilization collapsed. The new disorder, though regrettable in many ways, showed the healthy vitality of hopeful progress associated with more reasonable beliefs.

We are passing from the post-renaissance world to a new era. The discoveries of science are leading to world-wide changes, religious and moral, as profound as those caused in Western Europe by the spread five centuries ago of the ideas of classical civilization.

The first effect of the changes is to produce quarrels out of which wars may only too easily arise. The old outlook coalesces naturally with religious conservatism. The new outlook is the basis of political and social revolutions. Let me give an illustration.

In this country it has not been too easy, in spite of the efforts of liberal leaders in the National Church, to prevent a religious repudiation of the biological doctrine of evolution. We should, therefore, not be surprised that when elsewhere, where the Roman Church is powerful, a government arises which welcomes post-Darwinian biological ideas, its difficulties with its Roman Catholic citizens are immediate and profound. The Roman Church claims to be inerrant, and some of its dogmas have been bound up with the archaic speculations of the first chapters of *Genesis*. How can it possibly come to terms with a government which ranks Darwin among the greatest of the prophets?

It must be remembered, moreover, that Christian Churches, in spite of the teaching of Christ, almost invariably approve of war, 'in a just cause' as the saying is. But humanist intellectuals, with the new scientific outlook, tend to repudiate war and to press for international peace. Quite unexpectedly a new moral judgment that war is barbarous has arisen among the scientists whose discoveries, to their profound regret, have been used to make war more devilish than ever.

This moral condemnation of war, which in the past has been almost entirely limited to the Quakers, is a surprising outcome of the scientific era. As a characteristic of scientific humanism it is worth careful study. The new humanism is often condemned as the product of intellectuals who have no religious convictions: and it is asserted that such a lack of religious enthusiasm is associated with social insensitiveness. But in fact the fundamental principles of the new era are two in number, the veneration of knowledge and research and a regard for man's social well-being. Analyse these principles and one begins instinctively to say to

oneself, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Who is my neighbour? The reply comes back through the centuries: he is the hated enemy of my people — the Samaritan.

The scientific intellectual, trying by his research to understand more fully the pattern and significance of the universe, and rating kindness as a more valuable social principle than the patriotism that springs often enough from fear, is a religious man, Christian in sympathy, even though he stands apart from formal religion.

Yet, often enough, the new outlook of the scientific era is assumed to be anti-Christian or even atheistic. Current controversy uses the assumption, and it gains plausibility from some Communist teaching; but it is not justified by facts.

The modern intellectual finds God through Nature: Spinoza's *Deus sive Natura* is at the basis of his theology. He builds upon research and discovery rather than upon revelation. He does not on principle repudiate revelation. He retains an open mind because he finds that too often what is asserted to be revelation is associated with those traditional judgments of fact and fiction, of right and wrong, which he rejects. But his religious sympathies find a basis in the fact that his discoveries in the realm of physics reveal a planned world, the product apparently of a Mind, like to, though in quality and power transcendently surpassing, that of man. Current biological progress confirms and amplifies this understanding. So it becomes difficult to deny the existence of God, if the term be applied to the active Mind behind phenomena. The purpose of the plan of creation is by no means clear, or at any rate as clear as we could wish. Yet, arguing from instincts which are, he is convinced, of supreme value, the intellectual who builds religious faith on science tends to believe that God's nature and purpose are to be found in kindness. So in human life his final emphasis is on the brotherhood of man; and he tends increasingly to stress the need for kindness to lower animals who are also man's kinsfolk.

Probably it is true to say that the teaching of Jesus is more valued in the modern scientific civilization that is now being built up than it was in the post-renaissance world. Consider, for instance, the Chinese civilization that is now under the impact of changes emerging from Western humanism. It was polygamous, its leaders fighting for wealth and power. The new revolutionary leaders of China have surprised the world by their practical repudiation of traditional avarice. Largely by moral influences they have conquered territories containing millions of men with

comparatively little fighting; they have now denounced polygamy and cognate ills. Thus a new civilization, Confucian but also scientific, in sympathy with Christian idealisms, is arising among a people who can boast the oldest tradition of continuous civilized living known on earth. We cannot say what will happen when Chinese universities are fundamentally transformed by modern science—so far the transformation is in its infancy—but the future is of much promise. We can gain hope from this promise, for Western European civilization, under surface hypocrisies, had anti-Christian standards of living similar to those of unregenerate China. There is in science an austerity not to be found in war or predatory business. For this reason a scientific education is a purifying influence: it is a true humanism.

We must lay great stress on these facts as we consider the changes in moral judgment to which I wish now to direct your attention.

The most significant development which we observe in our science-controlled world is the vast increase in human fecundity. Medicine, as never before, is winning the fight against disease, and especially against illnesses fatal to infants and adolescents. As a result, population in most areas is increasing faster than food supplies. Malthus saw this possibility a century and a half ago. Happily the increase since then of the fertility of newly-developed areas and the slow progress of preventive medicine saved the situation for the time being. Now the world begins to find itself almost everywhere over-populated.

Analyses of the causes of unrest in various parts of the world have of late been fairly frequent. Almost always one finds embedded in them, behind a façade of political words, some reference to a population increase associated with semi-starvation. For instance, social disorder in some of the West Indian islands is dangerous. Poverty is endemic. One island has been described as a vast slum where legitimacy statistics are lamentable. Can we be surprised that in some of these islands the natives avail themselves of a citizenship which enables them to overflow into Britain where we find their presence a social burden? I put to you the thought that the old command, 'Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth' could be deemed divine so long as the world needed more human beings. The primitive need has passed. Now the world needs more good human stocks; but inferior stocks are increasing far too rapidly and are a menace to the future.

It is unnecessary to say that no race, no human group, no family, thinks itself rightly to be classed as inferior. The more numbers increase, the fiercer becomes the struggle for existence.

et, almost everywhere, the self-denial needed to limit population-increase is deemed a folly : the consequent rapidity with which the world-situation alters for the worse cannot but cause anxiety to all thoughtful people. Half a century ago most Churches condemned birth-control as immoral. To-day only the most reactionary maintain that view in this country. There seem to be signs that the Roman Catholic Church is modifying its attitude even in Southern Italy where dreadful poverty and fierce discontent are increased by American refusal to accept mass immigration. I personally can find nothing in Christ's teaching to cause us to welcome unrestricted population-increase when its direct outcome is a vast growth of human misery.

Once it is seen that in the new science-controlled world we are in danger of over-population, the doctrine that human life is inherently sacred becomes questioned. The doctrine remains axiomatic if the life be that of one who could be said to have been made in the image of God, a good man, healthy, and strong to give to humanity moral aims and a wholesome example. Yet, while the need for great and good leaders of humanity was never greater than at present, we cannot assert that love of our neighbour is a principle that should prevent us from trying to limit the increase of bad stocks. We should give to all human beings who are born opportunities of healthy and wholesome living. But we must accept the certainty reached by eugenic investigation that inherent degeneracy is not a product of slum life : nor can it be cured by better housing conditions or more ample food supplies : it is a consequence of dysgenic changes : and of their ultimate origin we are ignorant. So the question arises : is human life always sacred, whatever its quality or circumstances?

In the realm of this enquiry, as we all know, disturbing problems insistently press forward. Would God, as Christ revealed Him, under all circumstances disapprove of euthanasia? Owing to the progress of medical science, the length of life of men is increasing. We are living longer than our parents and many live too long for happiness. It is becoming almost a commonplace to hear a man say that his father lived too long : he would have been happier had death come sooner. Sometimes the man will add, 'me and the rest of the family would have welcomed euthanasia.' So clergymen and others of undoubted sincerity and Christian earnestness are pressing for legal change.

Other associated alterations of public opinion are showing themselves. In the post-renaissance era which is now reaching its end, suicide carried a grave social and religious stigma. But now the kindly coroner makes a formal excuse and a religious service is

rarely refused when suicide has ended physical malady. Of course euthanasia, as a mode of death, differs *in toto* from suicide in that a man is not renouncing his own life but concurring with the judgment of others. But can we always say that either is an affront to God as Christ revealed Him? Most of us, while condemning suicide in the abstract, would suspend judgment in a particular case, urging lack of knowledge of the circumstances. Enforced suicide excites indignant condemnation of the man who imposes it, though not of the victim, condemnation of Hitler, not of Rommel.

Probably the test of cruelty will be increasingly applied to a number of the problems now becoming insistent. Hitler's treatment of Rommel was cruel and his agents, like himself, deserved to be punished for cruelty. But when a medical man gives an overdose of morphia to a patient likely to have but a short time of misery while life lasts, he is animated by kindness, not by cruelty. He combines, in fact, knowledge and goodness, the two fundamental principles on which, I have suggested, our new scientific civilization will rest.

In the immediate future our new civilization is likely to have many a struggle within itself as its leaders see the ideal that should be sought and lack the knowledge by which it may be attained without action which some will judge to be worthy of moral censure.

I have in this address several times made mention of eugenics. May I speak with greater detail?

We have come to know that both grave physical defects in man and mental degeneracy are alike inherited. Progress in the science of genetics during the last half-century has revealed that the genes in the chromosomes of the living cell, alike in human beings and in other animals and plants, are carriers of hereditary units. These units change, sometimes for the worse, sometimes for the better. The causes of the changes are ill-understood, though it is known that some of them can be induced by radioactivity. When deleterious units appear, a new type of human being results with physical or mental defects that may make it unfit for civilized life. So far we know little of the location of defective genes within the living cell and nothing as to how they can be eliminated before mating. But there is a close likeness between human beings and other higher mammals; and no breeder of domestic animals would breed from individuals similarly tainted. Sooner or later, as over-population becomes acute, the question of preventing the increase of tainted human stocks will have to be faced; and violent controversy is likely to ensue. Our

present knowledge is sufficient to warrant the statement that sterilization in cases of mental defect would only be partially effective, though in view of the increasing number of mentally defective persons in Britain there is much to be said for the argument that half a loaf is better than no bread. Too often in our newspapers we read the verdict, 'guilty but insane,' after some dreadful crime by a mental and moral degenerate. Is the outcome of the verdict to be lifelong imprisonment rather than kindly euthanasia? I confess that I can give no confident answer to this question.

From time to time new mutations lead to the birth of children horribly defective or deformed. They can never grow up to have a normal happy existence. The question of euthanasia at birth for such infants is seldom discussed in public, but undoubtedly the practice is accepted as a regrettable necessity by some members of the medical profession. It would not appear to conflict with the fundamental religious principles of our developing scientific civilization.

Objections to sterilization and euthanasia gain strength from a belief that the defects to which they could be applied arise from what we may popularly describe as 'slum conditions.' The belief, as I have said, is mistaken. But it is strongly held and, like other primitive though mistaken beliefs, is most difficult to eradicate.

Mental and moral defectives tend, in populous industrial areas, to congregate in districts where their habits of life lead to overcrowded and insanitary houses. An enthusiast for better housing and social reform, once he has convinced himself that a bad environment produces human degeneracy, tends to find his belief confirmed by all he sees; and regards eugenic reformers as hard-hearted *bourgeois* indifferent to the unhappiness and suffering of the proletariat. Such a man may well become a dangerous reactionary, though he fancies himself a progressive socialist or even communist.

The emergence of sub-normal groups in an over-populated land is at present a cloud no bigger than a man's hand. Before another century has passed it is likely to become a cloud covering the whole sky.

Evidently the need for genetic research applied to humanity is vastly important. Unfortunately, there is already evidence that differences of opinion as to genetics are likely to lead to political and racial quarrels as violent as were religious differences four centuries ago.

The use of euthanasia or sterilization to prevent the increase of tainted stocks is sometimes thought to be a form of punishment,

and opposition to either is linked to objection to capital punishment. The fundamental difference needs to be continually emphasized. The mental or physical degenerate is not defective because of any personal fault, and the question of punishment does not enter in. Society needs, and will increasingly need, to prevent the increase of degenerate human stocks. Any action taken must both be kind to the individual and also tend to the ultimate welfare of mankind. It differs *in toto* from the stern punishment which brings a murderer's life to an end. Dislike of capital punishment is undoubtedly increasing, and one reason is the belief that hanging is unnecessarily cruel. Life imprisonment is also cruel though not so brutal. Should a murderer be likely to repeat his crime, if released, public opinion in the future will probably demand, not his execution, but his painless extinction.

Another problem raised by the destruction of human life is that of abortion. The destruction of an unborn child in a case of rape or to preserve the mother's life receives wide approval. But the use of abortion to protect a girl's good name after a moral lapse would lead to many abuses if ever the practice were legalized. Many an illegitimate child is potentially a valuable citizen, and the killing of such a one should not receive and, in fact, is most unlikely to obtain the approval either of a Christian or of a religious scientist. The problem of abortion is associated with our ethical standards as shown in marriage and divorce. In this realm few moral teachers would reject the ideals of Christian monogamy. These ideals seem to be winning their way in China; but there is unfortunately no evidence of similar progress in the Western democracies. It is in fact most disconcerting that regard for them seems to fall as the independent status of women rises. So far as such ideals are concerned, biological science seems to be completely neutral, especially now that venereal diseases can be said to be conquered. Among the tasks of the future the maintenance of a high standard of sexual ethics will probably be one of the most difficult. In no other realm of human activity will the union of scientific enthusiasm with Christian idealism be more valuable. I have said that the two main standards of the new scientific civilization will be knowledge and kindness. True to these standards, men and women in marriage must seek to understand the mind of the Creator—or, in Christian language, the will of God—and to strengthen their union by love.

I have virtually finished. But the dominating anxiety of our scientific civilization remains.

Sometimes, when the problems of over-population to which I have directed your attention are discussed, the plea is made that

war will recurrently end our troubles and therefore deserves our approval. There is, unfortunately, little doubt that atomic warfare can be so developed that mass-extinction results. It seems that such a development of atomic energy will be associated with the growth of great industrial areas and that such crowded areas in turn will be peculiarly liable to atomic destruction. Yet it is impossible to view without horror either the manufacture or the use of atomic weapons. The use of such weapons might empty an overcrowded world, but it would bring grave suffering of which most certainly God, as revealed by Christ, would not approve; and which no human being can rightly excuse. He who has heard the call, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' may without hypocrisy approve of bringing human life to an end when its burden has become intolerable: he cannot, to protect himself from fancied or real enemies, approve methods of mass-murder and mass-mutilation. If the alternative be a pacifism willing to endure and to suffer, let us choose it. We may lose our lives but the loss will ultimately be in the service of mankind.

AN EXPERIMENT IN THE USE OF LOCAL RESOURCES IN TEACHING CHURCH HISTORY

By W. RICHARDSON and S. G. HARRIES (Masters in Oundle School)

THE problem in teaching Church History springs from the fact that, unlike some aspects of secular history, it cannot be represented as a mere catalogue or series of events without both losing all significance as Church History, and even becoming positively misleading by the presentation of events and details as merely secular happenings without any religious significance or interpretation. Church History then appears sordid, because it is presented in the same guise as secular history in spite of an expectation of something on a higher level. The lesson then learnt most vividly is only too often *corruptio optimi pessima*, with a cynical disillusionment ensuing.

This can largely be overcome by teaching Church History against a background of local history and knowledge. If in a course on Church History local characters, events and antiquities can be cited and discussed in illustration of important periods or movements, then events and movements no longer appear as merely secular incidents or a series but as living activities of the

spirit and manifestations of vital religion. Pupils who see how religious beliefs mattered to all sorts of people, for instance in the seventeenth century, get not only a new understanding of that century, a more inward grasp of its history, but also a realisation that the same or the same sort of problems and beliefs matter now and are still a vital part of current events, and that an age may be better for taking them seriously. This method of approach is particularly suited to Church History and religion, for they cannot be isolated from the lives, thoughts and emotions of individual men and women without becoming unreal.

An experiment in teaching on these lines was recently made at Oundle School on the general theme of 'The Origin and Life of the Christian Church in England illustrated from the locality.' Preparatory work spreading over two terms was done in ordinary Divinity Periods of Sixth Form boys, and during the second term charts were drawn up and material collected to illustrate the theme. Visits to local villages and places of relevant interest were made for the purpose of photographs and sketches, and finally the work was exhibited on Speech Day.

An initial chart showed by map and diagram the various routes and channels by which Christianity came to these islands and converted them. It showed the British Church and the Celtic and Roman Missions up to the Synod of Whitby. Then followed an illustrated chart depicting the remains of a Saxon church at Castor founded by Kyneburgha, the daughter of the famous pagan Penda, King of Mercia. The third and several following charts attempted briefly to illustrate the life of the pre-Reformation Church in England by reference to the twelfth-century Norman church at Castor and the fourteenth-century domestic wall paintings in the Norman manor at Longthorpe Hall, near Peterborough, where Mr. Clive Rouse has recently revealed mediaeval domestic murals unique in England. Carved capitals in the church, of secular subjects such as Norman knights in contest for a fair lady and a boar hunt, were used to suggest that there was no sharp division between ordinary everyday life and religious worship. Everything was brought to church. Similarly, photographs and paintings of the domestic murals at Longthorpe, which combine both sacred and secular subjects like the Nativity or Apostles with sentences of the Creed and the seven ages of man, the work of the months, the wheel of the senses controlled by reason, and the contrast of the contemplative and the fashionable secular life on the four walls of the main room of the Manor, were used to show how sacred and secular themes were always before the eyes of the people in their homes.

Next came charts analysing and illustrating the causes and course of the Reformation in England and the Elizabethan Settlement, with photographs of a Peter's Pence Chest at Castor and of Burghley House and William Cecil's tomb at Stamford, and an original Elizabethan Prayer Book was shown. (It is perhaps worth while noting that in the previous year the History of the Prayer Book had been similarly demonstrated in celebration of its quatercentenary.) There then followed a section on the rise of sects, illustrated by Robert Browne of Tolethorpe near Stamford, and of Achurch near Oundle, the alleged founder of Independence; Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding, who attempted to build up the monastic life of piety and seclusion in the new conditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; William Law, the Non-Juror of King's cliffe, who illustrated the tenets of the Stuart-Laudian Church and combined a practical piety with an unusual English mysticism, and incidentally influenced the Wesleys and so Methodism; Philip Doddridge of Northampton; and Frederick Faber of Elton, who represented the Oxford and Romanist Movements. Perhaps a few details of these men and their work may be given.

Nicholas Ferrar lived in the years between the Elizabethan Settlement and the Great Rebellion, one of the most significant periods in English Church History. With the defeat of the Armada the acute stage of the conflict with Rome was over; the full power of Puritanism was as yet unrevealed.

Ferrar, a Fellow of Clare, studied in Italy and Germany, and after experience in politics and business turned from worldly advancement and founded a lay domestic community at Little Gidding. Bound by no vows, the community lived a life of ordered worship and good works. Its members observed the canonical hours, taught the young and cared for the sick and aged of the locality. A concordance compiled originally for family devotions became the prototype of the unique Harmonies, now treasured in the libraries of Harvard, the British Museum, and the Bodleian. Ferrar and his friend George Herbert were at one with the judicious Hooker in founding their Anglicanism on scripture, tradition and reason. Together they left a mark on English spirituality firmer than that of the enthusiast and more tangible than that of the mystic.

When the Puritans triumphed, among the clergy ejected was John Cosin, Dean of Peterborough. Eminent among Caroline divines, he had been Chaplain to Charles I. At Peterborough, too, Cosin, restored to his position, was one of the first to read openly from the Book of Common Prayer after the Restoration.

But full tolerance was still a distant ideal and in 1662 it was the Dissenters' turn to suffer ejection. Philip Doddridge was typical of many Dissenters who, excluded from the universities, combined the teaching and pastoral office in their Dissenting Academies in an effort to meet the need of Puritan ministerial education. Later lay students were admitted and the academies made a signal contribution to the enrichment of English education. There were several such academies in Northamptonshire—notably at Northampton and Daventry.

Doddridge's scholarly and versatile talents and his tolerant views won him the regard of many outside his denomination. As a citizen, Northampton Hospital is his monument; his hymns were still singing. His pulpit was open alike to the Calvinist Whitfield and to the Arminian Wesley. In an age marked by intolerance Doddridge said he would prefer death rather than exclude from the Communion a real Christian on the ground of his Arian tendencies. His *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul* is second only to Law's *Serious Call* as a guide to personal religion. It influenced, among others, William Wilberforce and William Carey.

It was in the favourable atmosphere created by Doddridge's scheme of 1741 that William Carey, the Baptist pastor of Kettering, founded in 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society. Carey himself went to India in 1793 and worked for forty years as an evangelist, translator and educator.

Methodism grew strongly in the shoemaking districts of east and south-east Northants. Wesley himself visited the county not less than six times. On his second visit in 1745 he addressed Doddridge's students at the academy.

There could hardly be a better illustration both of the religious convictions characteristic of this neighbourhood and of the steadiness with which they were held than Bishop White of Peterborough, who was deprived in 1689 as a Non-Juror like Law, though previously one of the Seven Bishops sent to the Tower by James II in 1687 for refusing to read the Declaration of Indulgence to Roman Catholics and Nonconformists.

The report of a visitation of Laud's Vicar-General to Oundle Church was given to illustrate Laud's attempts to suppress Puritanism in the Reformed Church of England, and photographs of the original Oundle Congregational Church and of its beautiful early eighteenth-century chalices on the Table set for Communion, together with its earliest Minute Book of the Great Meeting at Oundle, were used to give an idea of what the Independents stood for. Another chart showed a diagram of the organization of the Church of England from the King and

Archbishops and provinces to rural deaneries, parishes and vicars and their functions.

In this way it was hoped to give some understanding of the historical growth of the Church of England and also the reasons for the rise and tenets of the various sects. Attempt was made to show how they stood for re-emphases on important points of Christian doctrine, previously neglected and now forced to men's attention by events, and that such re-emphases were often right, necessary and valuable at the time and have a permanent value, but that in the natural heat and enthusiasm of the times such emphases were often themselves overstated and led to neglect and denial of other valuable aspects of Christian faith and practice.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE CHURCHES

By CANON H. K. LUCE, B.D., Headmaster of Durham School

‘**A** RELIGIOUS education is an education which inculcates duty and reverence,’ says Professor Whitehead.¹ Is this definition adequate, and, if so, how far is it likely to be accepted by those who are responsible for religious education in Britain to-day? Such questions raise issues of much importance. Ninety-five per cent. of adults, we are told, are not in touch with any Church; even if the Churches were to lose no more ground, the recapture of this army of the lapsed is an impossible task. The only hope of success lies in a campaign for youth, and for this Professor Whitehead's definition has three great advantages as a battle slogan—it is simple enough to command assent among ordinary people both within and without the Churches; it is such as to emphasize, rather than to obscure, basic Christian unity; and it sets out to teach qualities which are widely acknowledged to be lacking among young people since the war.

How far, then, does this definition express what is essential in Christian teaching, and what sort of content would it give to religious education in our schools? ‘Religion,’ says Professor Whitehead elsewhere, ‘is what the individual does with his solitariness.’² This is certainly not the popular idea of the meaning of religion—even less so among the dominant type of clergy nowadays than among the less indoctrinated, and therefore more critical, laity. It is not the whole truth about religion, which must

¹ *The Aims of Education*, p. 22.

² *Religion in the Making*, p. 37.

clothe itself in richer air if it is to be breathed easily and invigoratingly by ordinary men and women. But it is surely certain that religion has no lasting foundation unless it is grounded deep in the human heart—in that inner citadel where the quality of the individual's thinking and striving is determined by habit more often than by conscious direction. 'Keep thy heart with all diligence,' urges the Hebrew sage, 'for out of it are the issues of life.' 'Not that which goeth into a man defileth him,' says Jesus, 'but that which cometh from his heart.' It was in reasserting the supremacy of the inward over the outward in religion, proclaimed by the Hebrew prophets before Him, that Jesus was most directly at variance with the religious leaders of His day; and His teaching on this subject appears to be no more acceptable to the majority of our religious leaders to-day than it was to the Scribes and Pharisees. Doctrinal orthodoxy and regular participation in sacramental worship are emphasized as the marks of Christian discipleship more frequently than the inner qualities of the heart which no human eye can see. More priests than prophets adorn the episcopal bench.

Reverence for life because of the spiritual issues which hang upon it, duty as the translation of that reverence into ideal and action—we may surely believe that Jesus would have approved the inculcation of these qualities as the fundamental aims of education in His name. Put into simple language, this means to present as the essentials of Christian discipleship an underlying sense of responsibility to God, and a deep-rooted loyalty to the ideals of Jesus; and to insist that other elements in Christian practice, legitimate and valuable in their proper place, must not be invested with primary importance. Such elements are Church membership, worship, whether sacramental or otherwise, and the acceptance of the Christian Creeds—with reasonable freedom of reinterpretation and restatement in the light of modern knowledge.

To illustrate the practical effect of these principles on the religious instruction given in our schools, let me suggest how they offer guidance in the framing of a syllabus, and determine the main aims of the teaching itself, in a secondary school with boys or girls of fourteen upwards. The chief element in any syllabus must be study of the Bible, which is the principal storehouse of Christian faith and experience; but it is vital that the right parts of the Bible should be taught, and with the right aims in view. The most important thing in all class-teaching of religion is to make boys and girls think for themselves and give them the necessary data on which they can form their own opinions. A second-hand faith, imposed by others, is no use; the only faith

which will stand the test of doubt and difficulty is one which boys or girls have worked out for themselves, and have kept on criticizing and restating as the years pass and knowledge and experience widen.

In teaching the Bible, therefore, the Old Testament must be firmly subordinated to the New—the whole viewed as a progressive record of man's advance in the knowledge of God, with the teaching and standards of Jesus as the final test by which all the rest is judged. In the Old Testament it is the teaching of the Prophets that matters—against just so much background of Jewish history as is needed for its understanding—both as showing the development of the Jewish idea of God and standards of human conduct, and also as leading up to Jesus. In the New Testament the Gospels should be treated with the same critical methods as the Old Testament; when the dross is cleared away, the pure gold of Jesus' magnetic personality and the compelling beauty and directness of His teaching will stand out all the more vividly. The *Acts*, also critically treated, and some selections from Paul's letters (in a modern translation) should be linked on to an outline of Christian work and influence down to the present day—which can be most effectively presented to young people by means of sketches of great men and women. This should dispose of the idea that the Holy Spirit was 'turned off' about 100 A.D. The syllabus ought also to contain a comparison of Christianity with other living religions, which is specially valuable in bringing into relief the really distinctive elements in Christianity itself—'the genius of Christianity,' says Fosdick somewhere, 'lies in reverence for personality'; study of missionary methods and problems, and of the bearing of Christianity on social problems; and, in the Sixth Form, the outlines of the relation between religion and science, and religion and philosophy through such a book, perhaps, as B. H. Streeter's *Reality*, A. E. Taylor's *Does God Exist?* or (much more brief) W. R. Matthews' *Signposts to God*.

A similar catholicity, in the original sense of that word, and emphasis on fundamentals should characterize the daily worship in a school. Readings and prayers alike should concentrate on the primary elements in Christian belief, and on the simplest Christian duties. Readings should be drawn from a wide variety of sources, secular as well as Biblical, pagan as well as Christian. The purpose here will be to interest and suggest rather than to give systematic instruction—to stimulate thought about every kind of problem in relation to faith in God and the Christian moral standard—to make familiar (but not *too* familiar) what is

most valuable in both Old Testament and New, and to offer to the impressionable mind of youth the challenge of outstanding personalities of all ages and lands — new ideas to follow up, new targets of character and achievement at which to aim. Simplicity and directness are the most important qualities of prayers and hymns suitable for young people, for whom much of the theological language of traditional piety, no less than its exuberant emotion, is neither natural nor desirable.

Examine a cross-section, as they leave school at seventeen or eighteen, of boys and girls taught on these lines — what will you find? Some quite negative, of course, whether from innate lethargy or external influences stronger than those of school — that will always be so, whatever the teaching; some agnostic — not convinced about Christian belief or practice, but at least open-minded and truth-seeking, and conscious of Christianity's claim to be judged on its merits among competing philosophies of life; some sincerely Christian, not acolytes or yes-men, critical and perhaps unorthodox, but confident of the foundation of belief in God which they themselves have built, and determined, so far as in them lies, to apply Christian standards to their own and the world's life. From the open-eyed faith of such a generation of young people Church life could draw fresh honesty and vigour and tolerance; and there are many older lay people, now out of touch with the Churches or restless in their allegiance to them, who might be won back if such an influx took place.

FUNERAL ADDRESS*

in Truro Cathedral by the VERY REV. W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., K.C.V.O.,
Dean of St. Paul's

THE sudden and unexpected death of your Bishop has cast a shadow over the diocese, and far beyond it, for Dr. Hunkin was widely known and active in many spheres of Christian service — and wherever he was known he was held in respect and affection. Words on such an occasion as this are feeble indeed, and perhaps we should prefer to bear our grief in silence, but it has been thought that something ought to be said in tribute to the leader and friend whom we have lost, and I could not refuse the office which the Cathedral Chapter laid upon me. Alas! that my words must be so inadequate.

Joseph Wellington Hunkin was, I think, pre-eminently a man of courage. I shall never forget the earnestness with which an

* Delivered on November 3rd, 1950.

eminent Roman Catholic layman, who had been with him in the first World War, described him to me as the bravest man he had ever known. But that quality of courage was not confined to the battlefield or occasions of physical danger: it extended over the whole of his life and activity. He was morally and intellectually courageous. I do not believe it ever occurred to him to hesitate in doing or saying what he believed to be right from motives of prudence or expediency. Intellectual courage is perhaps an even rarer virtue than moral courage — and possibly hard to cultivate in the position of a bishop. I can testify that Joseph, your Bishop, was eager to face all the new questions raised by modern knowledge and was not afraid to state his conclusions even when they ran counter to commonly accepted beliefs. We may not always have agreed with him, but we could not fail to admire the intellectual integrity which refused to evade the challenge of criticism.

We should, however, have a very one-sided picture of our friend if we did not at once add that at the very core of his personality and the centre of his life was a deep loyalty to Christ and a firm conviction that the Gospel of Christ is the one answer to human needs. He was not one who poured forth glowing devotional utterances. I have sometimes thought that in his preaching he deliberately restrained that poetical gift which we know from his compositions he possessed. I believe that in his preaching and in his whole ministry he was always thinking of the average man and woman and trying to put himself alongside them and start from where they were. He had, in fact, a high regard for the ordinary Englishman and understood him and his point of view. He longed, I suppose, almost more than for anything else, to see them gathered together in one Christian communion and fellowship. Thus a notable aspect of his episcopate was his untiring effort to promote co-operation and mutual understanding among all Christian people. When he died he was Chairman of the Committee engaged on a new translation of the Bible, and admirably he filled that responsible position. He himself was proud and glad to be entrusted with this work, not only because it is a great enterprise of scholarship, but even more because it is a striking example of Christian fellowship and co-operation in which scholars of many communions take part.

I have noticed that almost everyone who speaks of him says, 'He was so human.' They mean, I think, that he had an inexhaustible fund of sympathy. In his dealing with the diocese he never allowed his zeal for efficiency to blind him to the personal relationship. To the Clergy he tried to be a true Father in God, going to great trouble to be in touch with all the parishes and to

keep himself informed of the difficulties of parish priests. To be, as he was, a diligent and just ruler and leader and at the same time the sympathetic friend of all is a wonderful triumph of the Grace of God.

As we take leave of our leader and friend in this world with thankfulness for what he was enabled to do among us, can we sum up his salient qualities in a few words? Not indeed completely, because no words can delineate a personality so many-sided as his; but I suggest that beside his courage and devotion to Christ our Lord there were two features which stood out.

First, he was always growing. His mind and spirit were never contented with what had been achieved. Always he was reaching out towards new truth and fuller understanding. Those who knew him best will agree that, like St. Paul, he never counted himself to have attained, but right up to the end he was pressing on to a deeper apprehension of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

And secondly, more important still, he was truly one who was holy and humble in heart. Surely there never was a Bishop so far removed from any touch of pomp and pride of prelacy. St. Peter tells us that we should gird ourselves with humility to serve one another, and that is precisely what Joseph Wellington, Lord Bishop of Truro, did. Because he walked humbly with God he was given the grace to walk in friendship and comradeship with all sorts of men and the grace to be always vividly alive in heart, mind and spirit.

We thank God on every remembrance of him, confident that He who has begun a good work in him, and through him, will complete it unto the day of the Lord Jesus. May he rest in peace and may light perpetual shine upon him in the Kingdom of our Father.

IN MEMORIAM

JOSEPH WELLINGTON HUNKIN,

M.C. (BAR), O.B.E., D.D.

The Modernist cause has sustained a most serious loss by the sudden death at the age of 63 of Dr. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro, Warden of Ripon Hall, Oxford, and Vice-President of the Modern Churchmen's Union. Born at Truro, educated at the Leys School and Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, of which latter, after a distinguished University career in mathematics and theology, he became Fellow and Dean. By ancestry a Methodist, the son of a devoted local preacher, he was ordained

in the Church of England in 1913 and served with great distinction as Chaplain at Gallipoli and on the Western Front.

In his capacity as chaplain his popularity was equalled by his gallantry: 'he was always in the front line.' His services were recognized by his being awarded the M.C. (with bar) and O.B.E. He was appointed Chaplain to H.M. George V from 1926-35, who appreciated his simplicity of manner, geniality, strong commonsense and courage. On retiring from academic life he was appointed Rector of Rugby and Archdeacon of Coventry. Conscientious, strenuous and pastoral in spirit, he was as much valued by his parishioners (and not least by the masters of Rugby School) as he had been in the army.

In 1935 he was appointed the eighth Bishop of Truro in succession to Dr. Frere. Although the first Cornishman to be Bishop of Truro he had had two very notable Cornish predecessors on the English Bench—Sir Jonathan Trelawney, Baronet, surnamed the 'spiritual dragoon,' one of the Seven Bishops sent to the Tower by James II. Trelawney had two characteristics in common with Hunkin—dashing courage and immense popularity with Cornishmen.

Hunkin's other Cornish episcopal predecessor was Colenso—'the bravest of the brave'—who as a bishop achieved the maximum of unpopularity throughout the whole Anglican Communion as well as in his own diocese of Natal, due in the former case to his Pentateuchal researches necessitated by his translating the Bible into Zulu and in the latter case due to his unflinching efforts to protect the rights and lands of the native people against the aggression of white colonists.

In moral courage Hunkin was a worthy disciple of Colenso, not simply in his loyalty to the achievements of modern Biblical and historical criticism, but also in his fearlessness of speech where other bishops were content to remain silent. In the House of Lords he not only defended the infliction of capital punishment on wilful murderers but advocated its infliction on those who perpetrated brutal assaults on defenceless victims who had not succumbed.

As successor to Bishop Frere, a saintly pietist and fine liturgical scholar who had done his best to 'catholicize' the inhabitants of a diocese largely Evangelical and Free Church, Hunkin, essentially a Liberal Evangelical, came into conflict in his policy and public utterances with the fanatical adherents of his predecessor and in consequence suffered much misrepresentation in the Anglo-Catholic Press. He had his reward by being called 'our Bishop' by the Dissenters in his diocese.

The Bishop's interests, however, extended beyond the ecclesiastical sphere. He was a great lover of good literature, especially fine poetry. He was also a great lover of nature, and here his particular interests were botanical — flowering shrubs. In the history of horticulture and arboriculture in his native county he became a great authority, and his articles on these themes in the Press roused the widest interest.

As a Modernist teacher he did his full share of educational work not only by his sermons and addresses but by the publication of a number of clear, concise and convincing books and booklets on the problems of Christian faith and practice in the modern world. Of his books we would particularly commend *The Gospel for To-morrow*, now published as a Penguin. Its scope is well expressed in its prefatory note :

'Many attempts are being made to re-state the essentials of Religion in the light of modern knowledge and in the language of to-day. But most of them are not thorough enough. Research has not only discovered fresh evidence but has also developed an improved technique for dealing with it. Modern thought has been moving rapidly. Religious thought has been moving too; but not fast enough to keep up. Religion is not a mere delusion. Its concern is with reality. But the expression of Religion is encumbered with much that is obsolete, sophisticated, and illusory. Absolute Truth may be beyond us, but we must get as near the Truth as we can. Religious societies and institutions must be forward-looking and forward-moving. Else, as mankind moves on, they will just drop into insignificance, and the world will one day wake with a start to discover and mourn their loss. For the spiritual inheritance which they have preserved contains much that is of the greatest value to the human race; and a united and sustained effort should be made to sift this out and make it available for posterity.'

From the list of his books in *Crockford* there is one omitted which deserves a place among modern Anglican books of devotion, *The Hill of the Lord* — 'a little guide' to the Service of Holy Communion — parish priests will find it useful to give to their confirmands.

His latest task in the field of Christian Education was his chairmanship of a committee of scholars engaged in producing a revised translation of the New Testament.

In Hunkin's Modernism, sound scholarship, breadth of religious outlook, spiritual insight and intense sympathy with those in doubt and difficulty were happily and effectively blended. His Modernism was of that valuable kind in which irreverence, scepticism and sophistry found no place.

H.D.A.M.

ROBERT GLADSTONE GRIFFITH

The Modern Churchmen's Union has sustained a grievous loss in the death of Robert Gladstone Griffith, Vice-Chairman and Honorary Secretary of the Union, who died on October 17th, 1950, as the result of a motoring accident. R.G.G. had just entered upon his retirement from direct parochial responsibility and was eagerly preparing for special activity on behalf of the Union under arrangements which had been made whereby he could give the whole of his time to the work with which he was so deeply in love. He had acquired a new home in an ideal setting and a new phase seemed to have opened offering him the opportunity to bring to full expression his sense of mission towards the dissemination of Modernism within the Anglican Communion. It is through the common realization of his inspiring personality and great endeavours that all members of the Modern Churchmen's Union can enter into the tragic circumstances of his death and offer their most heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Griffith in her heavy bereavement.

The loss of R.G.G. is so grievous to the Union that the possibility of its leading to a higher achievement may seem a strange conclusion. Yet if the cause of the Union is valid, the greater the loss we have experienced, the greater must be the possibility which it opens up. Could it not be that the loss of such a man could lead his associates to higher appreciation of the worthwhileness of their cause and to an intensification of effort and a revivification of purpose?

After forty years as an ordained priest of the Church of England, R.G.G. had reached the stage when his own ideas were clear and his sense of purpose intensified. Always anxious to work in the less crowded centres, he had held a series of livings including twelve years as Rector and Vicar of Farnborough from 1927-39. Here he came to clear realization of the great possibilities of Modernism and the need for it within the Church, and contributed much both in the counsels of the Union and also in the series of books which he put out during the early 'thirties. All the time he was seeking to bring out the significance of Modernism as he understood it for the life of the parish and for the understanding of the average parishioner. He had a unique gift for bringing that message within the understanding of the ordinary layman and also of translating it even into the methods of the religious education of the young. For this he had a particular flair: he understood the mind of the child because he himself had the strength of character blended with great spirituality which can alone enter into the inner thoughts of the simple as well as of the complex. Progressively

he moved through a developing experience and there crystallized out in his mind a strong urge to stand forward in challenge of what he considered to be wrongful exercise of ecclesiastical authority. Parallel with this, he was most active in the work of the Modern Churchmen's Union towards restatement of Christian doctrine in the light of modern scholarship whilst preserving its living Gospel as the hope of human salvation. For him Christianity has to be relived by each generation and re-expressed in inspiring and convincing terms: he was particularly insistent on the need for revision of the Creeds and Liturgy of the Church.

During the second world war he experienced heavy family sorrows which he bore with great fortitude and patience. Whilst they were still pressing upon him he yet turned to the task of putting the affairs of the Union on to a sound basis, and for the last three years of the war it was he who kept the Union alive and so ordered its affairs that it has been able once again to come into very active enterprise.

Here he found the opportunity for expressing himself enthusiastically and earnestly as was so inevitably part of his nature. Fired with intense spirituality, he could not do otherwise than take up every possible opening with an eagerness and a thoroughness which made his message so full of life. Joyously he embarked upon the Jubilee Campaign on behalf of the Union which was directed towards bringing the Branches of the Union back into flourishing activity. He went continually round to them inspiring fresh efforts to get the groups together; no disappointments would shake his resolve. The writer well recalls an occasion when Griffith called together a meeting of interested people in one of the great cities in the North. When we arrived we found a host of excuses and the meeting had dwindled to some three or four. At the last moment further excuses came to hand and we were left with an audience of one. R.G.G. addressed himself as zealously to the one as if he had been one thousand.

It was this spirit of eager endeavour and refusal to accept indifference on the part of others which most characteristically expresses the nature of the man. His personal life was so inspired by selflessness as to cause his own personality to provoke some corresponding response in all who worked with him.

His scholarship was of a high order and he spent much time in writing and publishing brochures in explanation of the Modernist position. Coupled with this, he had an overwhelming sense of what he regarded as the injustice of the authoritative pronouncements in the Church on the status of the innocent but divorced person. He was prepared to challenge any apparent

wrongful exercise of that authority with a courage which commanded respect. With no regard of the consequences for himself, he was prepared to marry such persons in his own church, and there can be no doubt but that he has by his fearless insistence in this matter, supported by the thesis contained in the late G. L. H. Harvey's brochure which gave the Union such a very clear status in this sphere, demonstrated the need for episcopal authority to observe due limits in interfering with the proper discretion of the parish priest.

This brief appreciation cannot conclude without trying to recall the personality of the saint, full of humour and kindness, sensitive to the efforts and qualities of others, especially receptive of scholarship and wisdom wherever it might be shown, yet all the time a keen worker in the parish and the focus of communal life wherever he went. It was inevitable that he should crystallize out for the Union the great possibility that its work in the field of scholarship must be paralleled by its work to get the parish priests themselves to proclaim and apply the lessons of Modernism as significant for the future of the Church. It was R.G.G. who kept together the regular Hayfield Conferences of men active in the parishes, with a view to bringing their own experience to focus and applying it to the revision of the Liturgy. It was R.G.G. who inspired the proposed Conference at High Leigh so that this work in the parishes might be intensified and a considered programme shaped for its active prosecution. It behoves us all to see that his work is given the most fitting memorial by ensuring that the High Leigh Conference next April will start the 'movement in the parishes' for which R.G.G. believed he had such a special mission.

HENRY SELF

A LAYMAN'S READING

By JOHN ROWLAND, B.Sc.

EVERYONE who reads, even though quite unsystematically, on serious subjects, will be struck from time to time by the way in which books appear to answer or comment on each other. And such complementary or contradictory books often come simultaneously into the hands of the reader at a time which suggests either a deliberate piece of planning on the part of publishers (which seems unlikely) or a coincidence so striking as to make one almost gasp. It was certainly so with me when, at almost the same time, I received two collective works, *The Enduring Gospel*

(S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.) and *Living as a Humanist* (Chaterson; 6s.). The first contains essays by leading Churchmen. Edited by Mr. R. Gregor Smith, its contributors include such eminent figures as the Bishop of Bristol, Prof. H. H. Rowley, Prof. T. E. Jessop, and the Bishop of Hanover. Its aim is to state the various ways in which the Gospel message can be approached. *Living as a Humanist*, on the other hand, is made up of essays by members of the Ethical Union, and, in consequence, is largely concerned to answer the generally supernatural beliefs held by many members of all Churches. It tends to beg the question here and there, especially in such sentences as 'to the humanist it is all-important to have experience of *real values*' (italics mine), where the word 'real' might with advantage have been defined. Yet it is a readable contribution to the great theological debate of our time, and, as such, a little more impartial than Mr. Hector Hawton's *The Thinker's Handbook* (Watts; 2s. 6d.), which claims to be a guide to religious controversy, but is actually a guide to the Rationalist attitude on all theological questions.

One of the problems of our day in these matters, indeed, is that impartiality is almost impossible in any book. Canon V. A. Demant, whose recent broadcast talks have made him almost a national figure, has issued some earlier ones in the little book entitled *What is Happening to Us?* (Dacre Press; 2s. 6d.), but here, though his diagnosis of the evils of our times will be readily accepted by most thinkers of all schools, there will be nothing like the same unanimity on the matter of his proposed cure for those evils.

It is almost a relief, after a reading of such contradictory volumes on purely theological themes, to turn to the philosophical aspects of science. Here, again, there may be no unanimity of thought, but there is a genuine unanimity of aim. Dr. Burniston Brown's *Science: Its Meaning and Philosophy* (Allen & Unwin; 15s.) may thus on the surface seem to have little in common with the late Max Planck's *A Scientific Autobiography, and Other Papers* (Williams & Norgate; 8s. 6d.); but when the two books are carefully analysed it will be found that their aims are not dissimilar. Planck's treatment of the inter-relationship of science and religion, and his suggestion that the real aim of the scientist is to find out God's plan for the universe, are the parts of his book which will be thought most striking by the theologian. Not altogether different in aim, though very different in method, is Sir Sheldon Dudley's *The Four Pillars of Wisdom* (Watts; 8s. 6d.), in which a prominent surgeon sets out his philosophy of education. The fact that he regards as one of the 'pillars' of an

educational system a reliance on some dubiously scientific psychology has struck many thoughtful readers as a flaw in his work.

On a more austere philosophical plane is Mr. Herbert Read's *Existentialism, Marxism, and Anarchism* (Freedom Press; 3s. 6d.), an all too short volume in which the most eminent art critic of the day discusses some of those philosophical trends which have become fashionable without (in many cases) being thoroughly understood. Even shorter are Dr. W. R. Matthews's *Reason in Religion* (Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d.) and a pamphlet by Miss Mildred Cable and Miss Francesca French—*What it Means to be a Christian* (Paternoster Press; 9d.)—but both of them are more valuable than their brevity or their price would indicate.

The last three months or so (at any rate as far as I am concerned) have been more free than usual from books on the puzzling problems of Christian origins. Certainly the best volume of this type which has come my way for a long time is Dr. H. E. Fosdick's thought-provoking *The Man from Nazareth* (S.C.M. Press; 12s. 6d.). In this book Dr. Fosdick details his considered opinion of the way in which the people of Palestine in the first century of our era looked at Jesus. The background is sketched in with a masterly hand, and most readers will have found Dr. Fosdick's treatment of the whole problem stimulating. Worthwhile, too, in this connection is Mr. F. F. Bruce's *The Dawn of Christianity* (Paternoster Press; 6s.), written by the Head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield. This discussion of the early days of our era, while not to be compared with Dr. Fosdick's volume, has a good deal of valuable information, not readily to be found within two covers elsewhere. And if it sometimes takes a line not quite acceptable to all who have studied modern Biblical criticism, it is none the worse for that. There are several books which I have read and enjoyed, though they would not be regarded as wholly acceptable, as regards their theological basis, by all readers of these pages!

There is, for instance, Mr. H. G. G. Herklots's *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament* (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.), which has many unusual ideas. There is Dr. A. S. Diamond's *Primitive Law* (Watts; 15s.), which avowedly sets out to prove the thesis (to my mind impossible to believe) that early law owed little or nothing to religion, but which nevertheless contains a good deal of extremely valuable information on primitive codes of law and the effect which they have had on human development. There is Miss Dorothy Donnelly's *The Golden Well* (Sheed & Ward; 10s. 6d.), a Roman Catholic writer's view of religious symbolism,

which suffers from the lack of balance shown by so many of the more mystical of Roman Catholics, but which has its points of interest.

It will be seen, from what I have written, that the last few months have been fruitful enough in the production of serious books of one sort and another. While, as I have already pointed out, these are of varying interests and varying points of view, the fact remains that I have been able to deal, in rather summary manner, with fifteen books, every one of which brings something worthwhile to the thoughtful reader. And that, perhaps, is the real value of the publishing trade as we know it in a democratic State. Whether on religion or politics, whether on art or science, we are able to weigh up opposing points of view. And in the specific field with which this magazine is largely concerned it is possible to read, in one and the same month, a book appealing on mystical grounds largely to the Roman Catholic world and a book appealing on grounds of pure reason largely to the Unitarian. That is as it should be. And while that continues I am sure that, whatever the superficial critic may feel impelled to say, the life of Great Britain will remain theologically sound.

CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM

RECENT LITERATURE ON CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM REVIEWED

By Prof. MARCEL SIMON of Strasbourg University

The horrors of racial anti-Semitism have led a great number of Christian and Jewish writers to meditate on the Jewish problem, and especially on the problem of Jewish-Christian relationships. Their aim has been mainly to find out both the real responsibility in the rise and development of anti-Semitism and the means of fighting it and achieving mutual understanding between Israel and the Christian world.

The most deeply moving among a vast number of publications on this subject is Professor Jules Isaac's book, *Jésus et Israël*¹. It is dedicated to the memory of the author's wife and daughter, who were killed by the Nazis 'simplement parce qu'elles s'appelaient Isaac.' A fruit of persecution, it is, in the writer's own words, 'the cry of an indignant conscience, of a broken heart.' But it none the less claims to be rigorously scientific in its methods of information and discussion. It is intended to show first that Christianity is in its origins and foundations a genuine offspring of Judaism; secondly, that neither did Jesus reject the Jewish people, nor are the Jews guilty of the crimes of which they are accused by the Christian Church. In the author's view these accusations are the sources of modern anti-Semitism.

The book insists in its first chapters on facts which are well known, but which it was necessary to recall to the mind of the average reader to whom

¹ *Jésus et Israël*, by Jules Isaac (Editions Albin Michel, Paris, 1948.)

the book makes its appeal: Jesus was a Jew by birth and education; he lived a faithful Jew, and his message, delivered to Jews, in the synagogues and in the Temple, can only be understood in the light of the Palestinian Judaism of his time, and shows precise affinities with traditional rabbinic and even pharisaic teaching. What Prof. Isaac says on the matter is fully documented, and he adds many interesting and valuable comments. There is, however, a tendency to minimise the originality of Jesus, and consequently to make the fact that the pharisees fiercely opposed him difficult to understand.

The discussion of the relations between Jesus and the Jewish people is more original and on the whole more convincing. Prof. Isaac opposes the view that the mass of the Jews rejected Jesus and were, therefore, rejected by him. In those days the bulk of Israel lived in the *Diaspora* and that, even in Palestine, Jesus, whose ministry lasted only a short time, came in touch with a comparatively small number of his countrymen. Moreover, it is doubtful whether Jesus openly and clearly proclaimed his Messiahship. Thus the idea of a deliberate, collective rejection of his message by Israel at large is an ecclesiastical affirmation rather than an historical fact.

It could, however, be objected that later on, when the first Christians proclaimed, in Palestine and outside, the Messiahship of their Master, they registered but little success with the Jews, whose proportion in the early Church soon became very small. This gives at least some support to the traditional idea of Israel's obstinate incredulity. But one fact remains certain, strongly emphasised by Prof. Isaac: there is not the slightest ground, if we limit ourselves to historical evidence, for accusing the Jewish people collectively of the murder of Christ. Prof. Isaac devotes the most interesting chapters of his book to a very careful analysis of the trial and condemnation of Jesus, and comes to the conclusion that together with Pilate and the Romans, who pronounced and executed the death sentence, the leaders of the Jewish people, especially the Sadducees, were alone responsible for it.

Prof. Isaac's book has been vigorously and not always quite fairly criticized by exponents of traditional Christian theology. It is true that it can be criticized. The author, who was not originally a specialist in this field of studies, has not always succeeded, in spite of very careful preparation, in approaching the problems from the right angle. There are shortcomings in his methods of New Testament exegesis: he is sometimes very conservative, giving excessive credit to the text, and in other cases is unduly sceptical: his conclusions suffer from bias. It is not legitimate to make the Christian Church entirely and exclusively responsible for Nazi anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism existed long before Christianity appeared. Some of its roots are to be found in Judaism itself, as a religious and national community, in its conception of the chosen people and its particularism. It must be noticed, on the other hand, that the Jews were not the only victims of Nazi racialism.

But the fact remains that anti-Semitism has indeed a religious aspect, and was reinforced by religious motives. It was Prof. Isaac's sacred right to denounce what appears to him and what is in fact a distortion of history. And it is the bounden duty of every Christian to support him in his crusade against the ever menacing revival of anti-Semitism.

In Prof. Isaac's opinion, the Jewish people did not follow Jesus because they had no possibility of knowing and acknowledging him as the Messiah.

Dr. Jocz's thesis² is to establish that, in spite of the separation of the Jews from Jesus Christ, and later their complete estrangement, there is 'an always present Jewish element within the Christian Church . . . The growing number of Jewish Christians (Dr. Jocz is one of them) belies the

² *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, by Jacob Jocz, Ph.D. (S.P.C.K., 1949.)

assertion that Christianity is a Gentile prerogative . . . the truth is that *some* Jews and *some* Gentiles have accepted Jesus Christ as their Master and Lord, while many Jews and many Gentiles have remained either indifferent or hostile to the claims which he makes upon men' (p. 4). In the Preface, a distinguished non-Christian Jew, Dr. Daube, bears witness to the 'sincerity, humanity and fervour' of the author.

This book, like Prof. Isaac's, begins with a discussion on Jesus Christ and the Synagogue. But the conclusions are different:

'The ultimate reason for the friction between Jesus and the authorities is not to be sought in a divergence of views on matters of doctrine. The background of the struggle is the claim to unique authority underlying the words and actions of Jesus Christ (p. 34). There can be no doubt that Jesus not only claimed to be the Messiah, which would have been no real offence to an Israelite, but that together with that claim he made demands and assumed an authority which were nothing short of blasphemy' (p. 40).

Then follow several chapters on Jewish-Christian relationships from the first century to the present day. On the question of the *Minim* (Schismatics) (pp. 51-57 and 174-190) the author comes to the conclusion that although the term primarily described Hebrew Christians, it also included other heretics: this, I think, is the most plausible solution to a very intricate problem. I should only add that even Gentile Christians were, in my opinion, sometimes considered by the Rabbis as Jewish heretics.

Of the development of an anti-Jewish policy in the Christian Roman Empire and during the Middle Ages, Dr. Jocz gives a general outline, summarising the results achieved by a number of scholars, and specially by Dr. James Parkes's works. He then briefly sketches the emancipation of Judaism and its effects upon Jewish life, and follows the development of a growing interest by the Jews in the person and message of Jesus: while orthodox Judaism rather hesitatingly comes to an attitude of 'guarded appreciation,' the liberals pay homage to his person; but in spite of these variations, both camps tend to the same conclusion:

'While there is a growing conviction amongst Jews that there ought to be assigned a place of prominence to Jesus in their spiritual history, all are agreed that there can be no place for Jesus in the religion of Israel.' (p. 129).

This is clearly illustrated by an analysis of the main results achieved by the Jewish *Leben Jesu Forschung*: 'The effect of Jewish study resulted rather in the breaking down of prejudice than in the building up of positive conceptions' (p. 145).

But this negative picture is not complete. The second half of the book is intended to prove that there always has existed and still exists within the Church a Hebrew Christianity, and proceeds to describe its rise and evolution.

The reason of the breach between Church and Synagogue lies, in the author's opinion, in the problem of the Law:

'The question at issue was whether the Messianic age inaugurated by Jesus of Nazareth could be brought into harmony with the institutions which were hitherto binding. The maintaining of both was a logical contradiction, and they virtually excluded each other' (p. 157).

This seems to me a questionable way of putting the problem. For there is little evidence that the first Christian community in Jerusalem really felt the contradiction. That there existed 'no *fundamental* difference of view between Stephen and the rest of the disciples' (p. 156) is an assumption not

very strongly supported. Except perhaps as regards sacrifices—and even here there is no certitude—the Palestinian Christians seem to have kept the whole Law very carefully: if we do not admit it, it becomes difficult to explain the conflict with Paul on ritual observances. Even the rejection of sacrifices would probably not have been a sufficient ground for persecuting the Christians: for the Essenes also most probably abstained from sacrificing. Moreover, to stress the opposition between Law and Messiah, as Dr. Jocz does, is to forget that even for the Christians the Messiah was still to come: only this second coming in glory could effectively bring with it the abrogation of the Law.

There is some contradiction in what Dr. Jocz says of the destruction of the Temple, A.D. 70. He convincingly shows that it gave a new impulse to the propagation of Christianity among the Jews. But later on (p. 199) he agrees with Hoennicke's view that it contributed to the disappearance of the Judaistic party. The real reasons of Jewish hostility is probably to be found in that destruction and in the use of Christian preaching made of it, and also in the steady growth of a radically antinomian Gentile Christianity.

This hostility, and the isolation from the rest of the Church of the Judaistic party led to the doctrine of the Hebrew Christian Church. But here again what Dr. Jocz has to say on Ebionites and Nazarenes and the alleged differences between the two is not entirely satisfactory: it will be useful in this connection to consult Dr. Schoeps's recent book, *Theologie und Geschichte des Juden Christentums*, Tübingen, 1949.

Whereas this Judaistic party of the Ebionites gradually disappeared, there always remained a *Judaic Christianity*, united with the main body of the Catholic Church. It nowadays constitutes what Dr. Jocz describes as contemporary Hebrew Christianity.

'Standing midway between the Gentile and the Jewish world, Hebrew Christianity performs a double function: it interprets Judaism to Gentile Christianity, and Christianity to Judaism.' (p. 258.)

But this position is no easy one. Whereas Gentile Christians can be loyal to Church and nation, for the Hebrew Christian:

'Loyalty to Jesus Christ spells the forfeiture of national rights . . . In the Hebrew Christian, thus, the drama of primitive Christianity is re-enacted. Loyalty to Jesus Christ becomes to him the supreme test of discipleship . . . National continuity of Hebrew Christianity will only be possible when the Jewish people lives its own life, upon its own soil, and can afford to grant to its members the luxury of personal conviction without endangering its separate existence.' (p. 260.)

The final chapter deals with the doctrinal opposition, for which there is no possible compromise, of Church and Synagogue. The main difference, as Dr. Jocz sees it, is in the doctrine of man: 'the Synagogue emphasises the *Imago Dei* in man, the Church stresses man's fall,' and his impossibility to save himself. From this fundamental opposition all other differences derive, concerning sin, mediation, the Messiah, Torah, and Revelation.

It might be objected that the opposition is perhaps a little exaggerated, and only concerns one very precise, absolutely pessimistic and almost dualistic interpretation of Christianity. This appears for instance in what Dr. Jocz says of Revelation and history:

'In the Jewish view, history is essentially the manifestation or unfolding of God's will. It is on these grounds that revelation and history can be linked up in one straight line . . . Revelation, to the Christian Church, is not something that runs alongside the world, and certainly

not something that merges with it; it is something that stands *opposed* to it. The word of God is primarily a word of judgment, a condemnation of history.' (p. 292.)

Not all Christians would subscribe to such a view. Barth probably would . . . But Dr. Jocz is perfectly right when he stresses the fact that, in connection with these diverging doctrines of man, the fundamental isms, determining 'the everlasting division,' is that of Christ.

'The division between Judaism and Christianity on an historical basis is thus fictitious. There is only one division: between the man who in his *actual* existential situation says yes, and the man who in his *actual* existential situation says no to the challenge which Jesus Christ presents.' (p. 322.)

Which denies—and here again there could be much discussion—the uniqueness of the Jewish *perfidia*.

All compromise being excluded, is there at least any hope of bringing the Jews to a more sympathetic understanding of Christian dogma? Professor G. A. F. Knight thinks there is'. His book is a typical product of what he himself describes as:

'The neo-orthodoxy of the present generation' which 'is humbly returning to the word of God to seek for the roots of its Christian faith, at last contritely admitting that the roots of Christianity are indeed to be found in the Old Testament and in the Judaism of the first Christian Century and nowhere else.' (p. 73.)

The last words call for an explanation, which is given right at the beginning of the book: 'Whether it be for help in the exposition of her theology, or whether it be for guidance in the formation of her outward organization, the Church has always made a mistake in turning to Greece' (p. 10). For 'the Grecian approach to the understanding of the Christian revelation is an approach that is wrong in itself' and 'the Hebraic interpretation of the nature of God is the only interpretation which the modern world can understand' (p. 12). Both Christianity and Judaism are to-day 'in a state of schism from the Judaeo-Christianity of the first century' (p. 15): Christianity is entwined with Greek philosophy; 'Judaism, again, is the result of a hardening, a fixation, of the negative reaction to the Christian emphasis upon one essential element within it, viz., the doctrine of the Person of God' (p. 16). Both religions must go back to those thought-forms which they had in common before the Church was influenced by Greece and which may, in the very precise meaning of the word, be described as Judaeo-Christian. Speaking again the same language, they will understand each other—and the Jews will possibly become Christians.

The book is, as indicated by the subtitle, 'a Christological study in the light of our Hebraic heritage' It is based on the assumption that, the Bible being one, nothing more is needed to explain the authentic Christology—which, of course, is found in the New Testament, excluding its later developments—than the Old Testament tradition, of which it is the fulfilment.

It is not possible, within the limits of this review, to follow in detail the demonstration, conducted with much skill and considerable erudition. The book certainly deserves close attention, and contributes many interesting points, chiefly on the immanentist features present in Old Testament theology. But it cannot be said that it is, on the whole, convincing, from the point of view either of doctrine or of history.

² *From Moses to Paul*, by George A. F. Knight. (Lutterworth Press, London, 1949.)

Much could be argued against that very narrow conception of revelation which, in its eagerness to vindicate the uniqueness of the Biblical tradition, feels it necessary to throw absolute contempt upon the Gentiles and upon reason, and considers it an integral part of the Christian faith to believe that:

'The philosophies of Greece and Rome, and of Germany and England, while they may be very interesting indeed, are entirely irrelevant to the purpose of God.' (p. 13.)

But this is only too well known an attitude nowadays, and it is not my concern to denounce it. On the historical field it leads to very disputable conclusions. A few instances must suffice.

Hellenism is made a scapegoat for every possible sin. We learn that a Greek disposition of mind on the part of many theologians since the second century 'has been the most powerful factor militating against the rapid growth and expansion of the Christian Church' (p. 15). How then is this nevertheless rapid growth to be accounted for? A similar reproach is made against Philo, whose philosophy 'is just not Judaism' (p. 19) and who is rather unexpectedly made responsible for the subsequently hardening of Judaism *vis-à-vis* the Incarnation theory of the Christian Church. Whereas Philo's influence upon Christian thought is, of course, denied: 'his heterodoxy became the rabbinic orthodoxy' (p. 116): it is doubtful whether many Jewish scholars will agree with this affirmation.

Later on, the conception of religion as 'a man's private relationship with God' professed by English Puritanism is traced back to Hellenism: 'Religion was personal experience, simple because the Greeks were individualists' (p. 174). But was not Puritanism fed on the Bible, and especially on the Old Testament? And if the Catholic Church remained untouched by this individualist trend, shall we then admit that it is less 'Greek' than the Puritans?

But there are more grievous faults. They proceed from the neo-orthodox conception of the perfect unity and complete heterogeneity of Biblical theology, and from the will to trace the essentials of early Christology back to the Old Testament, and the Old Testament only:

'Paul's theology in *Colossians*, though now more fully expressed has not changed in essence one whit from the primitive theology of the Book of *Acts* or, for that matter, from theology latent in the Old Testament from the Book of *Genesis* to *Job*.' (p. 144.)

To make the demonstration successful, the author is compelled to lay stress on those aspects of the Old Testament which are indeed in line with Christian theology, but which it is arbitrary to consider as being the very centre of the Old Testament message, as for instance the Wisdom speculation. This position forbids him to admit any external influence on the development of this speculation. For such influence, viz., of Greek thought, can only act outside the inspired Scripture: in Philo's works for instance, or in post-apostolic Christian theology. The author, therefore, carefully and rather arbitrarily distinguishes between the 'heterodox' speculation of Philo and the 'orthodox Wisdom School' (p. 146) in the canonical Scripture, the criterion of 'orthodoxy' being precisely the canonical character of the writings. And although Philo obviously proceeds from both the Septuagint and Greek Philosophy, Prof. Knight is compelled implicitly to deny any affinity, except on merely formal points of vocabulary, between him and canonical Wisdom literature, as well as any possible influence of Greek Philosophy on this literature, just because Hellenism, being the source of all intellectual sin and a doctrinal error, cannot have had the slightest contact with Revelation.

He is thus forced to read into the Old Testament every feature of the early Christology: a very difficult task indeed, as the author himself, in spite of all his skilful and only too subtle dialectic, is now and then compelled to admit: 'If there had been no Christ, *The Memra-Yahweh* concept would have remained in the obscurity it occupies even now in the thought of Judaism' (p. 121). This is, of course, in his mind, an illustration of the fundamental assertion that only the New Testament gives the key to the understanding of the Old. To an unprejudiced reader it will appear as the unwilling admission that the Hebraic roots of Christology are to be found only in secondary parts of the Old Testament. And even there we find very little evidence, if there is any evidence at all, to support the idea either of a divine Messiah, who is one with the *Sophia* or the *Logos*, or of a divine Incarnation. To ascertain this is only to stress what in Christianity is profoundly original. For a Jew to become a Christian requires more than just accepting with a clear conscience all the doctrinal implications of authentic Judaism as it displays itself in the Old Testament. It really requires going beyond Judaism. It requires 'conversion.'

If we turn from this Protestant neo-orthodoxy to the exposition of Anglo-Catholic orthodoxy by Father A. G. Hebert⁴ the first impression is rather good. Great attention is paid to the works of Old Testament scholars. Liberal writers are repeatedly quoted, and the author visibly endeavours to be objective and fair even to those schools of thought with which he does not agree. One is indeed very pleased to read such statements as this:

'The glory of Liberalism in the realm of scholarship has been that it has striven to the utmost of its power to be entirely honest and impartial in seeking the truth and learning what the facts really are.' (p. 110.)

But it very soon appears that the method and aim remain fundamentally the same as in *The Throne of David* (cf. *Modern Churchman*, September, 1949, p. 196). Fr. Hebert agrees with Professor Knight when he writes: 'When we think of the Bible as the Book of the divine Kingdom it becomes impossible to treat the Old Testament separately from the New' (p. 127). But being a Catholic he also appeals to the authority of the Church: 'The liturgy of the Church is the true school for the right interpretation of the Bible' (p. 138).

The authority of the Bible, as Fr. Hebert sees it, is triple:

- (a) 'If the Bible is to be what it needs to be, it must bear authoritative testimony to the events of the Redemption . . . to the historical events in which it is claimed that the Kingdom was established, when God acted in history to redeem His people and make His covenant with them. This must apply to both Testaments, to the Old Israel and to the New . . .'
- (b) The second question it has to answer is: 'What is the nature of the Kingdom, and what manner of service is man called to render to God in it, both under the Law and under the Gospel?' (c) And the third is: 'What is the end towards which God's saving purpose is directed, the fulness or completion of the Divine Kingdom in the reconciliation of man with God?'

Fr. Hebert hopes thus to reconcile faith and criticism, history and theology. But it is quite obvious that the historian will have to pay the whole cost: he is expected to admit the postulates formulated by the dogmatic theologian, or to use all his resources to prove that these postulates are valid, and that the Bible actually is 'what it needs to be': a very risky road to take, both for the historian and theologian. For it will most probably lead to distortion of history; and if the attempted demonstration falls short, then the whole

⁴ *The Authority of the Old Testament*, by A. G. Hebert. (Faber and Faber, London, 1947.)

theological construction will collapse, together with the very frail foundations which it has arbitrarily been built upon.

On the issue of Jewish-Christian relationship, which is our main concern in this review, Fr. Herbert's position is very close to Professor Knight's. It is expressed in a quotation from Fr. Lew Gillet's *Communion in the Messiah*:

'Jews and Christians have to acknowledge and even to experience in their spiritual life the immanence of Judaism in Christianity. A new and fruitful meeting between Judaism and Christianity implies a certain Judaization of the Christians as well as a certain completion of the Jews' Judaism.' (p. 312.)

'Back to the Bible' is the watchword. For 'the contemporary Church suffers through the weakness of its grasp of its rich Hebrew inheritance' (p. 313).

It is perfectly clear, in Fr. Hebert's eyes, that 'both Jews and Christians accept as essential to their traditions the Messianic hope announced by the Prophets' (p. 312). Now, the trouble is that, as regards the Jews, they do not seem entirely to share this conviction. It is highly significant that in Dr. Epstein's very able and readable presentation of Judaism⁵, only two short pages (pp. 135—136) out of over two hundred are dedicated to Messianism, and the word Messiah is not even mentioned in this connection.

It may, of course, be argued that the book is concerned chiefly with Judaism as an ethical civilization and a Way of Life. But is not this the very core of Judaism? Because Christianity started as a Messianic movement within Judaism, and its message was and still is focused on Christ, the Messiah, and because, on the other hand, it claims to be the true Israel, we are often inclined implicitly to admit that Judaism is essentially, and needs must be, Messianic. Messianic it is, indeed. The 'Way of Life' leads, as to its goal, to 'the Kingdom of God in all its resplendent holiness and glory' (p. 15). An image of the Kingdom is sketched in the final pages of Dr. Epstein's book (p. 220-222) under the very significant title 'The Prophets' Vision of Peace,' and 'The State of the Future.' But even here we do not find any characterisation of the Messiah. And in fact one may, I think, assert that Jewish Messianism culminates in the idea of the Kingdom rather than in the figure of a personal Messiah, on whom there does not seem ever to have been complete agreement, either in Biblical or in post-Biblical Judaism. And where the Messiah appears, his figure differs completely from the figure of the Christian Messiah.

Important though it be, Messianism is not the most important part of Judaism. A book like Dr. Epstein's shows very clearly, although it neither attempts nor even suggests the comparison, on what points Judaism and Christianity meet, and on what points they diverge.

They fundamentally agree on the code of ethics which, being based upon the Decalogue, is substantially the same in both religions. But their emphasis is not always on the same aspects of it, and there are sometimes important differences in the interpretation of notions common to Church and Synagogue. Dr. Epstein's chapter on holiness is in that respect particularly instructive. It lays stress on the essentially social and active character of holiness (p. 120) in the Jewish concept, on the very optimism of the Jewish religion and its positive attitude to the material part of the human creature' (p. 124). Asceticism, even mitigated, is altogether excluded by this rabbinic saying: 'A man is to give account in the hereafter for permissible pleasures from which he abstained' (p. 125). And there seems to be little room for

⁵ *The Jewish Way of Life*, by Isidore Epstein. (Edward Goldston, London, 1946.)

mysticism as well—the word does not appear in the index, nor does the word *grace*—in the Jewish way. This brings us very near to Dr. Jocz's remarks on the opposition of the two religions concerning their doctrine of man.

The doctrine of God, too, as expounded in Dr. Epstein's book, is not essentially different, in its main features, from the Christian one—excluding of course the Trinity. But here again, the same words may have a very different connotation: God as Redeemer (p. 129) simply means that He is merciful, and that 'His judgments upon individuals and nations for rebelling against His demands are not vindictive, but redemptive in character.' The idea of Incarnation is absolutely foreign to the Jewish mind and indeed to the Old Testament tradition. This is probably the most important point of complete disagreement between the two religions. As Dr. Parkes puts it, in a book which will presently be reviewed:

'In Judaism God says to man: fulfil My plan for creation; and man replies: I will. In Christianity man returns to God to say: fulfil that part in creation which I cannot because I am foolish and sinful; and God replies: I will.'

There is also, of course, the affirmation of the abiding vocation of Israel as chosen people and educators of mankind, and the permanent value of the Law, as expressed not only in its moral obligations, but in the religious and ritual observances which are indissolubly bound, as its complement, to the ethical code. What counts most for a Jew is not Messianism, but Torah: in it lies the redemptive power which Christianity attributes to Christ; and the chosen people itself is the vehicle of this redemption to the rest of mankind.

Thus, the Hebraic sources of Christianity, and specially of Christology, are to be found in marginal aspects of Israelite thought—Apocalypics on one side, Wisdom speculation on the other—much more than in the main stream of canonical Old Testament teaching, not excluding even the Prophets. That the message of Jesus is in continuity with the Prophetic tradition is obvious; but so is rabbinism; for the Prophetic tradition is many sided; and to account for the Christian interpretation of the person of Jesus we have to look elsewhere. And there is indeed little hope of bringing the Jews, however convincing the arguments might appear to a Christian, 'to believe in their own Messiah,' which Fr. Hebert inclines to consider as a preliminary condition of Christian reunion itself (p. 313).

Neither is there much hope, nor is it desirable to convert Israel to Christianity: such is the opinion of Dr. James Parkes, who has for years devoted the whole of his activities to fight anti-Semitism and to promote a real friendship between Jews and Christians⁶. With this aim he has written a series of books, equally remarkable for their outspokenness and generous inspiration and for the thorough-going scholarship on which they rest. The present book is a kind of a summary of the author's whole work and of his ideas on the subject.

The second half of it is chiefly a very illuminating account of what the relations between Christians and Jews have been since the separation of the two religions. It is completed by a programme of co-operation and active friendship proposed to Jews and Christians for the present. Important and interesting though it is, it rests on the principles ascertained in the first half, where the author expounds his personal views on the true nature of Jewish-Christian relationship.

The fundamental thesis is 'the equal permanence and validity of the revelations of Sinai and Calvary' (p. 9). Judaism and Christianity are

⁶ *Judaism and Christianity*, by James Parkes. (Victor Gollancz, London, 1948.)

complementary, rather than exclusive of each other: 'Each is true, each has essential meaning for men to-day.'

What then is the part each religion has to play? It is determined by their respective characters.

'The Christian religion is a mystery of salvation, and it converts by winning men singly to its life and teaching. Judaism is a way of life, and it converts by communicating some part of its way of life to the nations among which and within which it lives' (p. 37). For 'that which is unique in Judaism among the religions of the world is its sense of a community as the vehicle for the fulfilment of the purpose of God.' (p. 24.)

The centre of Judaism lies not in the Prophets, but in the Law, of which the Prophets are the commentators and auxiliaries. And more effectively than the Prophets, the Pharisees and the Rabbis contributed in creating 'a national community lovingly but laboriously committed to the task of embodying their teaching in their daily lives' (p. 27).

This is a very penetrating conception of Judaism, on which, I suppose, there would be large agreement among scholars. But it does not seem legitimate to reduce Christianity to a merely individualist type of religion, unless one holds that the endeavour to build up the Church as the New Israel has been a complete failure. Dr. Parkes seems inclined to think so, when he presents the emergence of the saint, as a new type of human character, as a specifically Christian achievement, and denounces a second type, equally brought forth by Christianity: the cleric.

This conception of Judaism as a living, and in a certain sense universalistic, religion presupposes the rejection of the traditional picture of it 'as a formal, exclusive and legalistic religion, which is a burden to its adherents.' And this rejection has naturally led the author

'to a revision of the nature of the conflict between Jesus and Pharisaism, and even more, to a reassessment of the nature of Paul's conception of the Law, and of his relations with Pharisaic Judaism after his "conversion" . . . For there is no evidence of any violent break between the teaching of first century Pharisees and their rabbinic successors. The result has been a rejection of the Christian traditional interpretation of Paul' (pp. 10-11).

On the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, Dr. Parkes has some very interesting and balanced observations to make. Not only did Jesus live and die a Jew; but moreover, there is nothing fundamental in his teaching which 'is not to be found adumbrated in Pharisaism.' This, in its turn, is consistent with earlier, even prophetic, Judaism. If, in spite of these affinities, Jesus was finally opposed by the Pharisees, it was because, while adhering to the Law, he did not assent to the development of Pharisaic *Halachah*.

'The conflict was concerned with two methods of bringing men into contact with the living God . . . All through His preaching there is the same direct call to get to the heart of things, and such an attitude naturally ignored the 'fences' and details' of Pharisaic *Halachah*, not because it opposed them, but because it scarcely noticed them.' (pp. 60-61.)

Jesus, in doing so, returned to the method of the prophets. But the Pharisees themselves were trying 'to make prophetic religion a reality in daily life.' As the result was not yet achieved, they could not but be hostile to

'a successful preacher, even if his objectives were the same, who both followed a method they believed by their experience to be unsuccessful,

and actually made their task more difficult by encouraging people to think that they were themselves leading people away from and not towards the ideal of a life in contact with God.' (p. 63.)

This, and not the Messianic claim, which moreover was not openly made by Jesus—Dr. Parkes here agrees with Professor Issac—was the main reason of the conflict. And Dr. Parkes tries to show, with good arguments, that the Pharisees had little or no responsibility in the trial and condemnation of Jesus, which seems to have been an essentially, if not merely, Sadducaic business.

The most original and, probably, the most contestable part of the book is the chapter dealing with Paul. Here the thesis is that Paul, far from being 'the conscious founder of a new Gentile Church' (p. 81), remained under the Law his life long, only rejecting, as did Jesus himself, 'the place which the ceremonial law and the interpretations of the Pharisees were coming to occupy in Judaism' (p. 107). Even more: there is a large amount of evidence 'that he considered the way of life of Judaism to be the basis even for his Gentile converts, and the whole Law the basis for himself and Jewish Christians' (p. 101).

If by 'way of life of Judaism' we mean the Jewish code of ethics, then of course Paul considered it as the basis even for the Gentiles. But there is in this respect an essential difference between his converts and a Jew or a proselyte: the conduct of a Pauline Christian, although it be in perfect conformity with the Law, is not imposed on him by the external compulsion of the commandment, but proceeds, as its natural consequence, from the life 'in Christ': we are on mystical and not on legalistic ground.

As regards Paul's own attitude, the arguments are taken chiefly from *Acts*, and from those episodes where Paul's behaviour is that of an orthodox Jew (*Acts* xxi, 20-26, etc.). Dr. Parkes is certainly right in considering these facts as historical. But he is wrong in the interpretation he gives of them. A vow in the Temple can have, in Paul's opinion, no absolute value. It is just an indifferent and harmless gesture, which may readily be made, if in abstinence there is a danger of offending other people. Paul has himself given the explanation: 'And unto the Jews I became a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the Law, as under the Law, not being myself under the Law, that I might gain them that are under the Law' (I *Cor.* 9, 20). 'All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not . . . Give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God' (I *Cor.* 10, 23 and 32): it clearly appears from the last sentence, as from the one in which Paul says that he *became* a Jew, that he does not count himself one of them any longer, except on certain occasions; a Gentile he never was; he does in fact belong to 'the Church of God,' the *tertium genus* of the Christians. And he insists that within the Church there should be no difference between Jews and Greeks.

Dr. Parkes quite rightly asserts that Christ, and not Paul's views on the Law, is the heart of the Apostle's message. But, here again, it must be stressed that Christ and the Law exclude each other. There is no contradiction between 'the outpourings of adoration and devotion, of love and wonder, at the feet of Christ, to be found in *Ephesians*' and 'the laboured argumentation of the earlier and longer letter to the *Romans*' (p. 89). One who lives 'in Christ' lives in conformity with the moral prescriptions of the Law, but not under the Law. Christo-centric mysticism, which is the core of Paulinism, is in itself, and by its anti-legalistic implications, a significant cause of rupture between the rising Church and the Synagogue. And, in fact,

Dr. Parkes holds Paul 'primarily responsible for the fact that instead of a gradual and peaceful development without schism a violent break between the two faiths took place' (p. 107). He thus tends to get back to the traditional view of Paul. But he has at least drawn attention to the complexity of Paul's message and attitude, and cautions his reader against too rigid an interpretation of it.

His views on the whole problem of Jewish-Christian relations deserve very close attention. So does especially his appeal for a reform of Christian education and theology, on the line of what he calls 'a new orthodoxy' (p. 38). The word, as he uses it, has not at all the same meaning as for Prof. Knight. 'I say orthodoxy, because

I am convinced that the reform movements in each (Christianity and Judaism), while quite inevitable and indeed valuable contributions, have not yet found the way forward. To substitute the noblest generalisations for a concrete belief and a concrete discipline is to substitute a candle for a searchlight.' But 'traditional Judaism and traditional Christianity both belong in their formulations to a world which has passed, and which will not return. It is time we accepted that; and that we each continued and developed the meaning of those events whose early interpretations, whether in the Pentateuch or the Talmud, in the Gospels or in Patristic theology, rightly served their times, but will not serve us to-day' (p. 38). 'Revelation,' says Dr. Parkes, quoting Archbishop William Temple, 'is always an event; it is never an interpretation. The task of interpretation is man's (p. 25) . . . While the latest conclusions of the scholars have only a transitory validity, the conception that these conclusions do, in fact, have only a transitory validity, that they ought to have only a transitory validity, and that it is the will of God that they shall have only a transitory validity, because the duty of interpretation according to the best knowledge available at the time is a continuous duty; this is a new doctrine of the meaning of the Scriptures as spiritual, as profound and as rich as the old doctrine of verbal inspiration. If it were universally taught in the Churches that in the Scriptures we had *interpretations* of revelation, not revelation itself, the way would be open for the fundamental changes which are necessary . . .' (p. 166-167).

Thus, thinks Dr. Parkes, true understanding will be achieved between Christians and Jews, and thus they will be able to assume together what the Church failed to do alone in the past, namely 'the task of guidance of the nations' (p. 181). *Quod faustum felix sit!*

CORRESPONDENCE

MODERNISTS AND THE R.P.A.

SIR,

I cannot help expressing my surprise at Mr. Hardwick recommending The Rationalist Press Association to readers of the *Modern Churchman*. I have always been (as a Christian) strongly opposed to this Association because I have believed them to be a hot-bed of atheists who are endeavouring to gather others who have a remnant of faith in God or themselves into their net. Just read through their list of hon. associates, they are all atheists or agnostics. The methods they employ to add to their number are similar to the spiders with the fly! For an example: On the last page of *The Wonderworld*, by A. Gowans Whyte, written for small children—an excellent book in every way, there is a short paragraph: 'I hope too, that it (this book) will help you

to answer many other "hows, whys, whens and wheres." Some day perhaps you will ask yourself: "Where did all the religions come from?" and you will find that all of them have come from the notions of long ago savages about ghosts and gods.' This book was written by the present acting chairman of the R.P.A.

After having studied their propaganda methods in its various forms I have come to the conclusion that it is a dangerous association for anyone to lightly tamper with. If I have been mistaken in this conclusion I am prepared to think over and further investigate the question.

N. VERSFELD

Stawel Klip
Piketberg, C.P.

MR. HARDWICK'S REPLY

Inasmuch as its declared objective is to uphold reason against superstition, the Rationalist Press Association seems deserving of support. But if ivy growing up a tree trunk appears to be doing the tree harm, you do not cut down the tree, but merely remove the ivy. Similarly, you do not need to eradicate religion in order to get rid of any superstitions with which it may be associated. The tactics of Mr. Gowans Whyte, referred to by your correspondent, seem to me to display the same ineptitude as that of a man felling a good tree to prevent it being smothered by ivy. The trouble is that the R.P.A., like other praiseworthy organizations, is handicapped by the short-sighted and uninformed zeal of some of its supporters.

ANGLICAN EVANGELICAL GROUP MOVEMENT

SIR,

I have been asked by leaders of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement to seek your permission to correct a statement made in the June number of *The Modern Churchman* under the heading of 'Signs of the Times,' page 101. The statement is as follows: 'It was Canon Vernon Storr, . . . who founded the Anglican Group Movement.'

Canon Storr was our President for many years and we owed an immense debt to his leadership. No individual member made so great a contribution to its policy or its work or its literature, but the Movement was in existence long before his arrival on the scene. It began as a private venture amongst liberal Evangelicals as far back as 1906 and may be said to have been founded, at the suggestion of that great missionary Douglas Thornton, by those known as the 'Liverpool Six'—Lisle Carr, B. C. Jackson, H. E. H. Probyn, A. J. Tait, A. F. Thornhill, F. S. Guy Warman.

It grew in strength and influence until the first world war under the name of the 'Group' or the 'Group Brotherhood,' though still private rather than public in its organisation and operation. Like other societies it sagged during 1914—1918, the years of the first world war, but a revival came shortly afterwards. It so happened that I was its Chairman in 1923 when, at its Annual Conference at Coleshill, Birmingham, the decision was taken to become a public movement under the title of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. I had made the acquaintance of Canon Storr shortly before that time and interested him in what we had in mind. It was my privilege to introduce him to the brethren at Coleshill and very soon he became our greatest asset and threw himself wholeheartedly and with unflagging enthusiasm into our work, becoming first our Honorary Organising Secretary and later our much loved President.

T. GUY ROGERS

[We regret that the limitation of our annual paper supply has necessitated the holding over of a number of letters to our next issue.—Ed., M.C.]